

Vol. XI No. 3-4

July-October, 1989



# THE STAR OF THE EAST

213

مَجَلَّةُ الْكَوْنِ

an ecumenical journal dealing specially with  
the oriental and eastern orthodox churches



# THE STAR OF THE EAST

كوكب الشرق

An ecumenical journal dealing specially with  
the Oriental and Eastern Orthodox Churches

THE DELHI ORTHODOX CENTRE  
2, Tughlakabad Institutional Area  
New Delhi-110 062

## CHIEF EDITOR

Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios

## EDITORIAL BOARD

H.G. Mathews Mar Coorilos	H.G. Dr. Philipose Mar
H.G. Geevarghese Mar Osthathios	Theophilos
Revd. Fr. K. G. Thomas	Revd. Dr. V. C. Samuel
Revd. Fr. T. J. Joshua	Revd. Dr. M. Jacob Kurian
Mr. P. A. Oommen	Mr. K. M. Mathew

## EDITORIAL ADVISORS

Revd. Fr. Stewart, Cambridge Brotherhood, Delhi-6  
Revd. Fr. Hambye S. J., Vidya Jyothi, Delhi-6  
Very Revd. Archpriest Vitaly Borovoi  
Revd. Fr. Ion Bria, W. C. C., Geneva

## BUSINESS MANAGER

Revd. Fr. M. S. Skariah

# THE STAR OF THE EAST

Vol. XI No. 3-4

July-October, 1989

## CONTENTS

Editorial	1
The Patriarchate in the Christian Church, History of Its Early Development —Paulos Mar Gregorios	5
Mixed Marriages —Fr. Dr. Jacob Kurian	14
Towards Global Peace with Justice for All— Asian Pacific Perspectives —Rev. Dr. Christie Rosa, Sri Lanka	22
Statement : Third Asian Christian Peace Conference Delhi Orthodox Centre, New Delhi-October 2-6, 1989 —Rev. Dr. Christie Rosa, Sri Lanka	27
Changing Contours of Socialism —Paul Gregorios	34
News and Notes	55



## Editorial

We apologize for the delay in the appearance of this double issue. Our resources are limited. We have no full-time staff to bring out the *Star* in time always. Despite heavy losses in running this periodical, we are determined to persist. We count on the heightened co-operation of our readers and subscribers.

### The Future of Socialism

The prestigious *Sunday Times Magazine* (U.K.) of October 29, 1989, has on its front page a broken statue of Karl Marx, and the title in large two-inch letters: "COMMUNISM R.I.P.". Its first page has a headline: "The Death of Communism", and its opening words are:

"Marx began *The Communist Manifesto* with the words: 'A Spectre is haunting Europe-the Spectre of Communism,. That Spectre is now being exorcised: this issue of the magazine chronicles its passing'".

The whole issue of 90 four-column pages are virtually dedicated to chronicling the "death of Communism".

One can understand why the British aristocracy think that with Socialism out of the way, Capitalism can celebrate its triumph. Hungary and Poland have consciously opted out of communism and embraced market economy capitalism. Even in the Soviet Union, Marxism seems to have been compromised in at least four different ways. (1) The classical Marxist principle of Class Struggle, once considered the hallmark of Marxist socialism, has now been pushed to the margin; global humanism and the survival of humanity are the new principles governing social analysis and action. (2) The other key principle of Marxist Socialism, namely peoples' ownership of the means of production, has been substantially mitigated by the law on enterprises and the law on



co-operatives, which permit private ownership of productive property. (3) The profit motive, once decried as the abominable hallmark of Capitalism, has now been re-instated as an incentive to social production in all four sectors of the socialist economy—agriculture, industry, services and information. (4) The fourth important principle of Soviet Marxism in which each socialist nation is responsible for defending the security and integrity of other socialist nations has been abruptly dropped and denigrated as “Brezhnev doctrine” of the “period of stagnancy” This has already had disastrous consequences not only in Poland and Hungary, but also in East Germany and Cuba where many Soviet publications are today banned.

Indeed Marxism seems to have accepted defeat, and to welcome its own funeral. Even in the Soviet Union, large numbers of people have begun to embrace the market economy and to desire a total abandonment of socialism. There is talk of a New Europe, conceivably with German industrial-technological prowess as its basis, about to emerge by 1992. People are already reacting to the prospect of a strong re-united Germany, some with horror, but many with hope.

In China too, though something like *glasnost* and democratisation may have to wait till the passing away of the present gerontocracy, socialism as an ideology has long been compromised by a pragmatic bringing in of Transnational Corporations and a large, growing private sector. The talk today in Chinese intellectual circles is of bringing back a revived and reformed Confucianism to replace the Marxist ideology.

In Vietnam socialism was compromised at the time of the North-South merger. In Ethiopia, the pressures are quite strong to introduce market economy elements. Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Romania are also moving that way. In Cuba and North Korea there are attempts to hold on to old style Marxism, but quite likely they too will take to the new beaten path, once Fidel Castro and Kim Il Sung are out of the way.

So it is not just vested class-interest wishful thinking that

emboldens the *Times* to proceed to chronicle the exorcism of the Spectre of Communism.

\* \* \*

Actually the variety of Communism, officially labelled Marxism-Leninism, that took shape in the Soviet Union was indeed a far cry from text-book Marxism. If the text-books were right, socialism should have first triumphed in the most industrially developed countries like Germany, U.S.A. and Japan. In actual fact the two major countries that went socialist belied text-book Marxism by jumping from feudalism to socialism without passing through the in-between stage of capitalism.

And now, in a sense, they are all going back to text-book Marxism, after a little unanticipated detour. The technology, management, financing and organisation necessary for a Communist society can be developed only through a Capitalist economy and social structures. So China and the Soviet Union are internationally going back to a measure of Capitalism, they say, in order to get all the technology, the banking system, the communications systems and the working habits necessary for good socialism.

This again may be wishful thinking on the part of those who think that they can temporarily espouse capitalism and at will return to socialism. What seems to have happened is that socialists are succumbing to temptations for gratification of their commodity needs.

Socialism demands a sense of dedication, discipline, and self-giving which human societies are seldom capable of. Especially when one's dedication and self-sacrifice is misused by socialist dictators and apparatchiks for their own self-aggrandisement.

One form of communism seems now to be really passing. The Capitalists have reason to feel a sense of triumph. That sense of triumph may actually lead to the collapse of capitalism. In the U.S.A. the argument that it was American military strength



that brought Eastern Europe to its knees is used to increase military expenditure. This will temporarily benefit the "death merchants" and arms manufacturers and the politicians and employees dependent on these. But they will be digging their own grave in the process. There is a limit beyond which military expenditure cannot bolster up the market-hungry market economy. That point has already been reached, it now seems.

If in the euphoria of triumph, the market economies continue their policy of domination by military strength, the capitalist system which has survived many crises will meet that crises it cannot overcome.

Perhaps it is from the debris of that collapse, and from the remnants of the old socialism that a new socialism must arise, with slightly brighter prospects. Humanity needs it. So real socialists should prepare the way.

## THE PATRIARCHATE IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH—HISTORY OF ITS EARLY DEVELOPMENT

(Paulos Mar Gregorios)

The institution of the Patriarchate in the Christian Church cannot be located in the historical records before the Council of Chalcedon (451) and the laws of Emperor Justinian (483-565). The Code of Justinian was published in 529 AD. We have access today only to the revised edition of the Justinian Code, which dates from 534 A.D. This paper shall attempt a brief summary of the developments leading to the establishment of the Christian Patriarchate by the Council of Chalcedon and Emperor Justinian in the 5th and 6th centuries, and some of its later developments.

Today the Patriarchate exists in all three branches of the Eastern Church,

- (a) in the Eastern Orthodox Churches of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Moscow, Bulgaria, Serbia and Romania,
- (b) in the Oriental Orthodox Churches, i.e. in Egypt, Syria, Ethiopia, and also in Armenia and India as Catholicos—Patriarch and
- (c) in the Church of the East (Patriarch Baghdad).

### Pre-Christian Background

In the Old Testament, the Patriarchs are the heads of the twelve tribes of Israel. This is the sense in which in the New Testament the Protomartyr Stephen speaks of *Patriarchēs*. Abraham is not called Patriarch here. He fathered (*egennēse*) Isaac, Isaac in turn fathered Jacob and Jacob the twelve patriarchs (*tous dodeka patriarchas*—Acts 7:8). The (eleven) patriarchs sold (the patriarch) Joseph into Egypt (Acts 7:9).



St. Peter's address in Acts 2:14 ff refers to David as "Patriarch David" (*per tou patriarchou Dabid*—2:29).

The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews calls Abraham the Patriarch (7:4).

The common meaning of "Patriarch" in all these usages is "head or ruler (*archēs*) of a tribe or family (*patria*) or nation".

The institution of the Patriarchate among the Jews seems to be of very late origin. The term *Patriarchēs* which is Greek has many Old Testament equivalents: chiefly,

- (a) "heads of the tribes"—*ra'sei-ha-mittoth* 1 Kings 8:1
- (b) "rulers of the families of the sons of Israel"  
*nshi'ei ha-aboth le-benai-Yesrael* 1 Kings 8:1
- (c) "heads of the families of the congregation"  
*ra'sei-aboth ha-edah* Numbers 31:26
- (d) "heads of the families of the tribes of Israel"  
*ra'sei-aboth ha-mittuth le-bnei-Yesrael* Joahua 14:1
- (e) "princes of the families" *Sarei-ha-aboth* 2 Chr. 29:6
- (f) "princes of the tribes of Israel"  
*Sarei-shibtei-Yesrael* 2 Chr. 29:6
- (g) "heads of the tribes, rulers of the families"  
*rasei-ha-mittoth nishiei-ha-aboth* 2 Chr. 5:2

It is interesting to note that in Hebrew and in Greek the word 'family' (*āb, patria*) is derived from 'father' (*ab, patrēr*). Though no fixed term for the concept of patriarch can be located in the Hebrew, the institution was present, as a kind of *pater-familias*, but never for the chief ruler of all the people of Israel. The New Testament uses the Greek *patriarchēs* for the ruler David, King of Israel, but such usage does not seem to have been common in the Old Testament times.

It seems probable that the Greek title *Patriarch* was given to the leader of the Jewish people in Babylon, but this cannot be documented as far as I know. But the Christian fathers refer to

the Jewish Patriarchs, one chief of all Jews in the Roman Empire—the Patriarch of Tiberias, and a second, the Chief of all Jews in the Persian empire, the Patriarch of Babylon. These institutions continued till the end of the fourth century at which time the title has not passed into Christian usage. Origen (ca 185—ca 254 AD) in *Peri Archon* (Bk 4: ch 1), Epiphanius (ca 315—403 AD) in *Heresies* (Haer: 30), Cyril of Jerusalem (ca 315—386 AD) in his *Catechetical Orations* (12:7), and Theodoret (ca 393—ca 458) in his *Dialogues* (Dial. 1) refer to the Jewish institution. Theodoret expressly says that the Jewish institution was abolished. The Theodosian Code (ca 429 AD) says that the Jewish Patriarchates are extinct (*Cod. Theod. Libr: 16 tit 8. see also lib 29*).

#### Development in the Church

Among Christians, the title and position of Patriarch seems to have first arisen among the Montanists. Jerome's Epistle 54 addressed to Marcel says:

*"Apud nos apostolorum locum episcopi tenent: apud eos episcopus tertius est. Habent enim primos de Pepuza Phrygiae patriarchas: secundus quos appellant Cenones: atque ita in tertium, id est, pene ultimum locum, episcopi devolvuntur"*.

While for the Church, the bishops represent the place of the Apostles, for the Montanists, bishops come third, after the Patriarch first, and the Cenones second.

The Council of Chalcedon (451) is the first among the Councils to mention patriarchs expressly. In the second Act of the Council we read

*Hosiōtatai patriarchai dioikēseōs hekarēs*

Act 3 calls Leo "Patriarch of Great Rome".

The Church historian Socrates says that the title came into use between the Council of Constantinople (381 AD) and the Council of Ephesus (431 AD) as an honorific for some eminent bishops (*Hist. Eccl. Lib 5. ch. 8*).



Except in Alexandria and Constantinople, in all other Patriarchates (Rome, Antioch, Jerusalem), the Metropolitans of the Provinces presided at the ordination of the bishops, while the Patriarch presided at the ordination of the Metropolitans or bishops of the provincial capitals. Justinian's Code simply makes this practice part of the law (*Novella* 7: ch 1 and 131: ch 3).

Patriarchs themselves were enthroned or where necessary ordained by the Synod of the *Dioikesis*. Diocese here is a term for the whole jurisdiction of the Patriarch, and not the bishop's jurisdiction.

The Council of Chalcedon defined the powers of the Patriarch as mainly:

- (a) to convoke and preside over a general synod of his jurisdiction including Metropolitans and bishops; and
- (b) to hear appeals from Metropolitans, provincial synods and bishops about decisions of Metropolitan or provincial synod.

Justinian's Code confirms these Canons and makes them law (*Codex Just., lib 1: tit. 4.ch 29; Novella* 123: ch 22. See Photius' *Nomocanon* tit. 9. ch. 1).

It is clear that the Council of Chalcedon gave power to Patriarchs to censure Metropolitans and bishops, and the Code of Justinian made this law (*Novella* 37 : ch. 5).

The Patriarch has also at the middle of the 5th century power to send a Metropolitan as his delegate to any diocese for enquiry about a complaint. In addition he has also the power to promulgate ecclesiastical laws approved by the Synod of his jurisdiction.

The most powerful of the Patriarchates at this time was Alexandria, where the Patriarch or *Papa* (*Bawa* in Arabic) can even pardon criminals condemned by the civil authorities. The Pope-Patriarch of Alexandria was the first to assume Papal

powers, long before Rome did. His jurisdiction was the largest—not only the whole four provinces of Egypt, but also the provinces of Libya and Pentapolis; he thus was ruler over six large Roman provinces, with some 100 bishops. He also presided at the ordination of all bishops, not just Metropolitans as was the case in the other patriarchates. In addition he held the power to ordain presbyters and deacons in all episcopal jurisdictions, though he often delegated these powers to metropolitans and bishops. This was unique and unusual. No other metropolitan or bishop held such power, including the Patriarch of Rome who in the fifth century has some 69 bishops in his jurisdiction. All the six provinces were in civil authority subject to the Praefectus Augustalis of Egypt—the six provinces being Thebais, Arcadia, Augustanica, Aegyptus, Libya Inferior and Lybia Superior, i.e. Pentapolis).

### The Rise of the Patriarchates

The documents of Nicea do not even speak of Metropolitans, but invariably only of bishops—bishop of Rome, bishop of Alexandria, bishop of Antioch. Obviously the pre-Nicene pattern of a persecuted church was to have a bishop for each local church, assisted by a number (not always 12) of presbyters, and of deacons (not always 7).

The institution of Metropolitan comes after the Church was recognized by the Roman State at the beginning of the fourth century. There are no pre-Nicene references to a Metropolitan. Eusebius in his *Church History* (Book III) refers to the various successions to the Apostolic office, in terms of cities and not regions—first bishop in Athens is Dinoysius the Areopagite (H.E: III 4:10).

Linus the first bishop in Rome (III:2), received "the episcopate of the Church of the Romans" after the martyrdom of Paul and Peter. Euodius was first bishop in Antioch before Ignatius who was second; and Ammianus was the first Bishop in Alexandria. St. John the Apostle was still alive during the episcopate of these first bishops, but he seems to have exercised no authority over them. He could of course hardly manage to exercise such autho-



city, given the hardships of travel and communication. According to Eusebius St. John went around appointing bishops in Smyrna, Hierapolis, and Ephesus, Polycarp and Papias having been among the first.

Even Victor of Rome, (d.198) whom Eusebius calls "President of the Romans", who threatened to excommunicate other bishops in Asia and called upon all bishops (without success) to hold Synods everywhere to settle the quartodeciman controversy about the date of Easter, did not exercise any authority outside Rome. In fact the other bishops of the Empire censured him for his severity.

Only in Jerusalem, where the "throne of James, Brother of the Lord" was preserved to Eusebius' time (ca 260-ca 340), there was some special honour given to his successor as bishop of the "Mother Church", but he has no special title as Metropolitan or Patriarch.

Sozomen (early 5th century), the Palestinian church historian and lawyer in Constantinople, continuing the Church History of Eusebius (his nine books of church history cover the period from 323 to 425), dependent to a large extent on his contemporary and predecessor Socrates (ca 380-450), mention only bishops—Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople; Timothy, bishop of Alexandria in Egypt; Helladius, bishop of Caesaria in Cappadocia, Gregory, bishop of Nyssa, and so on. (*HE* Bk VII : ch IX). In Book III, he says that the "Roman Bishop" admitted St. Athanasius to communion when he fled to Rome. According to him Eastern bishops assembling at Antioch and responding to his rebuke for excommunicating St. Athanasius conceded only *Philotima* or honour to the bishop of Rome, because of the apostolic foundation of the Church in Rome and its civil status as a "Metropolitan Church". The Eastern bishops rebuked the bishop of Rome for accepting St. Athanasius to communion and for having insulted the Eastern bishops. (Sozomen, *H.E.* Bk 3 : ch Viii).

Even V. Martin, an apologist for Papal authority, and writer of the article on "Ecclesiastical Centralisation" in *Dictionnaire*

*de Theologie Catholique*. (Vol XI : pp 1877-1944), admits :

*"Toutefois, l'on peut dire que, pendant les quatre premiers siècles ces recours à Rome n'ont lieu qu'à titre exceptionnel et pour les difficultés particulièrement grave. Les évêques ne mélangent point le siège apostolique aux soucis normaux, quotidiens, de leur gouvernement"*

(DTC XI:1878/79)

The "right of appeal to Rome" is often cited by many western writers as evidence of some sort of over-all jurisdiction for the Bishop of Rome. The fact that St. Athanasius took his case to the Bishop of Rome is no indication that Alexandrian bishops believed in Rome as a Court of Appeal above their own bishops. The Bishop of Rome was evidently quite powerful and influential in the 4th century. That is reason enough for many eastern bishops to take refuge there when harassed or disciplined by their own synods. Churches in N. Africa and Gaul, it is true, did regard Rome as a Court of Appeal—for Latin Peoples. Emperor Gratian, in responding to the Roman Council of 378 A.D., decreed that Rome is Court of Appeal for all *western bishops*.

### The Patriarchate of Constantinople

As the Capital of the Empire goes to the East, to Byzantium renamed Constantinople in 330 A.D., the Bishop of New Rome naturally regards himself to have similar powers as the Bishop of Rome ~~naturally regards himself to have similar powers as the Bishops of Rome in the west.~~ The Council of Constantinople (381) gives him pre-eminence after the Bishop of Rome, a decision which neither Rome nor Alexandria recognized as valid. The title *Oikoumenikos Patriarchēs* came into use around the sixth century, but was never accepted by the other patriarchates, especially by Rome or Alexandria. Justinian's Code of Laws is of course addressed to the Patriarch of Constantinople, Epiphanius, not to the Bishop of Rome; but it expressly says that no decision affecting the unity of the Church should be taken without reference to "The Blessedness of the Most Holy Pope and Patriarch of ancient Rome, since he is the chief of all the priests of God" (Code 1:1 tit 1).



In the beginning the authority of the New Patriarchate of Constantinople is limited to Thrace (presently part of Romania), according to Canon 2 of the Council of Constantinople. But with the victory of Hellenism in the Eastern Empire inaugurated by Emperor Marcion and Empress Pulcheria through the Council of Chalcedon in 451, the Patriarch of Constantinople becomes a super-patriarch, with Asia (Ephesus) and Pontus (Caesaria) sub-ordinate to him, but in no way approaching the power of Alexandria. When in the 16th session of Chalcedon, the Pope's delegates objected to Pontus and Asia being placed under Constantinople, they could not have their way, since the bishops of Asia and Pontus supported the proposal. Canon 9 and 17 sanctioned the appellate authority of Constantinople only in regard to Pontus and Asia. By Canon 28 and Act 16 of the Council of Chalcedon, the Patriarch of Constantinople has appellate rights in 28 provinces of the Empire, i.e. Thrace (6 provinces) Asia (11 civil jurisdictions) and Pontus (11 provinces). No universal jurisdiction or primacy was granted to the "Ecumenical Patriarch" with the consent of the other Patriarchates.

By the time of the Code of Justinian there are at least 12 primates in the Empire, only 5 of whom claimed to be Patriarchs, i.e. Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople and Jerusalem. The Primates of Cyprus, Asia (Ephesus), Pontus (Caesaria), Macedonia (Thessaloniki), Illyricum Occidental (Sirmium), Italy (Milan), Africa (Carthage), France (Lyons), Spain (Toledo), and Britain (York), though enjoying powers equal to the patriarchs, prefer to call themselves Primates, or Metropolitans, or Archbishops. There were autocephalous Metropolitans (*metropolitai autokephaloi*) in Cyprus, Bulgaria, Georgia, Armenia etc. Some like the title Exarch by the time of the Second Council of Constantinople. Theodore of Ephesus signs as "Metropolitan of Ephesus and Exarch of the Asian Dioikesis", and Philalethes of Cappadocian Caesaria as "Exarch of the Pontic Dioikesis". The 9th and 17th Canons of Chalcedon permit appeal from Metropolitan to Exarch, but further appeal could be made from Exarch to Patriarch. Domnus of Antioch who signs as "Exarch of the diocese of Oriens" seems accepting the supreme authority of Constantinople, but the majority of the believers at this time in Syria are with the Syrian Patriarch who has broken communion

with Constantinople, as a result of the Christological controversy.

### Conclusion

Actually all Patriarchs were Archbishops with jurisdiction in more than one province. Emperor Justinian made the title Archbishop superior to that of Metropolitan, whose authority was usually limited to one province of the Roman Empire. When he founded the new city of Justiniana, he made the bishop of that city Archbishop, saying: "*volumus, ut non solum metropolitanus, sed etiam archiepiscopus fiat*". Chalcedon called Cyril of Alexandria, and Leo of Rome as well as Flavian of Constantinople, Archbishops. (Act 16, Act 4, Canon 30). Bishop, Metropolitan, Archbishop, Exarch, Patriarch—that is the gradation. As far as sacramental powers are concerned, all the bishops are equal, whatever be their title. The powers are in relation to administration and judicial appeal.



## MIXED MARRIAGES

### Issues related to Christian mixed marriages with special reference to the relations between the Roman Catholic Church and the Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church.

Fr. Dr. Jacob Kurian\*

#### 1. Introductory

In this paper 'Christian mixed marriage' refers to the marriage between two practising christians, a man and a woman, belonging to two different Christian denominations and continuing to be so in married life. Such a marriage has been pictured in various terms as 'inter-christian', 'inter-church', 'inter-confessional', 'confessionally mixed' and 'ecumenical' marriage. In the present discussion we concentrate on the theological and pastoral issues involved in the concept of 'inter-confessional' marriage between the faithful of the (Roman) Catholic Church and of the Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church.

#### 2. A brief note on the western discussions on 'interconfessional marriage'.

Since the pastoral issues related to inter-confessional marriages are more alive in the West than in the East, many of the related discussions also took place in the West during the previous years. These discussions have, on the one hand, highlighted the complexity of issues and tried to clear many misunderstandings and on the other hand, expressed the concern of the Churches to approach the issues as an ecumenical opportunity.

\*Fr. Dr. Jacob Kurian is on the Faculty of the Orthodox Theological Seminary, Kottayam, Kerala, India. He is also the Secretary of the Inter-Church Relations Committee of the Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church.

Among the many questions touched by such discussions<sup>(1)</sup> the following are significant :

- i. What is the difference between marriage as a universal institution and marriage between christians?
- ii. What is the significance of marriage as sacrament and as a mystery?
- iii. In what sense is marriage a covenant?
- iv. What are the actual or seeming contradictions between theological statements and canonical practice regarding marriage?
- v. To what extent a positive ecclesial role could be identified in inter-church families?
- vi. How to respond to the pastoral demands involved in mixed marriages such as, giving an official consent to such a marriage, celebrating an 'ecumenical' marriage, catering to the pastoral needs of the partners, giving baptism to and upbringing the children etc.
- vii. How to approach the situations of divorce and re-marriage?

It is to be noted that all these questions are relevant in the present discussion too.

#### 3. A glance at the christian marriage situation in India

Although many of the issues raised in the western discussions are significant in the Indian christian situation too, the Indian

(1) We specially refer to the following documents :

- i. Report of the Ecumenical Study Consultation convened by the Secretariat for Faith and Order and the Department on the Co-operation of Men and Women in Church, Family and Society. June 20-24, 1966, Crêt-Bérard, Switzerland.
- ii. The Malta Report (Catholic-Anglican), 1967-68.
- iii. Report on the inter-national consultation on mixed marriage held in Dublin (2-6, Sept. 1974) under the auspices of the Irish school of Ecumenics.
- iv. Final Report, Theology of Marriage and problems of Mixed Marriages (Lutheran, Reformed, R.C.), Venice, 1976.



situation is marked by the following facts :

- i. The pluralistic Indian context and the minority-position of Christianity pose equally the issues related to inter-religious mixed marriage.
- ii. The majority of Christians in Kerala belongs to the St. Thomas Christian Tradition. The St. Thomas Christians and others in Kerala follow a sociological structure of bride following the bridegroom in all relationships. This implies that in interdenominational marriages, quite often, the bride should join the bridegroom's Church and submit to all the ecclesiastical obligations of the bridegroom's Church. But in some cases where the communal and ecclesiastical bonds dominate, the bridegroom may have to join the bride's Church for the sake of marriage. In both the cases what happens is not an inter-confessional marriage.
- iii. There is also the situation where the concern for communal or racial identity prohibits an interdenominational marriage among Christians.
- iv. The Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church and the Roman Catholic rites (despite the provisions in the Catholic canonical instructions), in general, follow a similar policy regarding inter-denominational marriage, i.e., encouraging if the Church gains a new member and discouraging if the Church loses a member. The discouragement is often expressed by not giving an official consent-letter (Kuri) to such a marriage.

The above facts point to one thing. The concept of an inter-confessional marriage is yet to be seriously (not only in principle but also in practical terms) considered by the Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church and the Roman Catholic rites in India. Hence we may need to consider the theological, ecclesiological, canonical and practical aspects of inter-confessional marriage bearing in mind an important fact pointed out by Adrian Hastings :

“The ecclesiology undergirding an inter-church marriage and

the pastoral principles that should be of service in this area can not be discovered through academic discussions or ecclesiastical lawmaking alone.”<sup>(2)</sup>

#### 4. The theological and other aspects of inter-confessional marriage : an Orthodox response

The Orthodox response to inter-confessional marriage is necessarily an implication of the Orthodox understanding of Christian marriage. Marriage is a universal institution and the Scriptures endorse this fact. According to the Old Testament, marriage has been instituted by God for the beauty, meaningfulness and perpetuation of humanity : “Then the Lord God said, ‘It is not good that the man should be alone; I will make him a helper fit for him’.. Therefore a man leaves his father and his mother and cleaves to his wife, and they become one flesh.” (Gen. 2.18, 24).

As God gave new life to His own creation through Jesus Christ, so He gave new status to His own institution of marriage through the sacrament of Christian marriage. According to the Christian revelation marriage assumes a new status by being placed in a relationship with Christ and His Church in the Kingdom of God. The christian husband and wife are called to transform their love after the model of Christ and His Church (Ephesians 5).

Marriage and Celibacy are two vocations within the Church to experience the life of the Kingdom of God within history. Marriage and Celibacy are two forms of community life within the Church for the perfection of the personality to grow towards the eschatological style of angelic life envisaged by Jesus Christ (Matt. 22:23-33). There is a special grace given in Christian marriage to experience the sacrificial love among the members of the family in the model of the mutual love between Christ and the Church. Since there is a special status, involving a special grace to form ‘a domestic church’, the Christian marriage is a *mystery* (sacrament) occupying an integral role in the salvatory scheme of Jesus Christ. Christian marriage naturally implies that Christ

(2) Editorial art., *One in Christ*, 8974-4.



unites two members of the Body of Christ to grow into the full measure of the life within that Body, through family life. This means two important facts in the understanding of Christian marriage: (1) Christian marriage, for its meaningfulness, has to be between two members of the Body of Christ who share the same faith and the same eucharistic communion. The couple is not simply taking a mutual covenant, rather they are entering into a special status of a common covenantal relationship with Christ and the Church. (2) Christian marriage, is not simply a contract or covenant between two Christians, rather a sacramental act of unification by Christ through the ministry of the Church. Christ is uniting them and dispensing the sacrament through the priest. Hence, the priest is not just an official witness, but the chief celebrant of the priestly role of the Church, in all the mysteries of the Church including marriage.

Now, what are the implications of these theological facts to the concept of inter-confessional marriage?

1. The concept of an inter-confessional marriage is theologically untenable because the theological foundations of Christian marriage are not safeguarded in such a concept. Both the partners should share the same faith and the same eucharistic communion to enable them to experience the gifts of the mystery of Christian marriage. This speaks for itself, the Churches' position regarding 'ecumenical' celebration of inter-confessional marriage, ecumenical celebration of baptism etc.<sup>3</sup>
2. Since all the sacraments of the Church are sacramentally completed in the Eucharist, the sacrament of the holy matrimony is also intended to be completed by the partaking of the partners in the holy eucharist. It is to be noted here that in the Orthodox tradition, the marriage ceremony was originally integrated in the Eucharistic liturgy.
3. Since Christian marriage is a new status of union in Christ, it is not dissolved even by the death of the part-

(3) Cf. Synodal decisions of the Malankara Orthodox Church, 1976-1983, p. 6 ff.

ners. It implies an eternal spiritual covenant with Christ. Endorsing Christ's and the New Testament's witness against divorce and remarriage, the Church never admits divorce and remarriage as a regular social institution. However, in clear cases where the grace of marriage did not fructify, the Church may admit that the grace was not received and therefore tolerate separation and remarriage within a spirit of penance.

#### 6. The "promises" demanded by the *Motu Proprio*: its practical implication - an Orthodox response

As far as the present writer knows, the official Catholic attitude on mixed marriage is best expressed in Pope Paul VI's *Motu Proprio: 'Matrimonia Mixta'* of 31st March 1970. This is considered as a consummation of the deliberation in the Bishops' Synod in 1967. The *Motu Proprio* approves "the communion" status of those who "believe in Christ and are validity baptized". As an implication of it, the *Motu Proprio* concludes that there existed in a marriage between two baptized persons "a certain communion of spiritual goods which is lacking in a union where one partner is baptized but not the other", (para 5). The document imposes a *promise* on the Catholic partner to profess his (her) faith and to transmit it to the children, and demands a *canonical form* (according to the R.C. norms of marriage) of the celebration of marriage, and gives a general instruction on mixed marriages which can be applied in a flexible manner in different situations according to the directions of national bishops' conferences.

Regarding the last two points, the present writer expects certain clarifications:

1. How can a genuine pastoral concern, other than a superficial 'missionary' concern be expressed in such a *promise* from the Catholic partner? How can one who enters a divine covenant be expected to give such a promise in a matter where both the partners are equally responsible?
2. Regarding the *canonical form*, the Catholic Bishops' Conference in India has yet to make clear what it means by



the *canonical form* in a marriage between the faithful of the Roman Catholic Church and the Malankara Orthodox Syrian Church.

## 7. Concluding remarks

1. The Orthodox participants do note the special status for the Orthodox Churches being given in the documents of the 2nd Vatican and afterwards. This would naturally imply the urgency for facing the theological and pastoral issues regarding inter-confessional marriage between the Roman Catholics and the Orthodox. The Roman Catholic official position seems to be that the concept of inter-confessional marriage is acceptable in principle.
2. But the very concept of an inter-confessional marriage presupposes two church-membership. Two church-membership presupposes difference of faith and spiritual communion. This concept is theologically and pastorally problematic. On the other hand, it would be feasible to promote discussion on doctrinal and ecclesiological differences and then *establish communion*, keeping the autonomy and identity of the Churches. This would enable us (i) to give official letters for inter-church marriage<sup>(4)</sup> (ii) and to come into a definite agreement on the canonical form of celebration of 'inter-church' marriages, the type of baptismal sacramental form and the extent of participation for the clergy belonging to the other church etc.
3. The Orthodox Church is not in favour of conceiving grades in Christian church-status. What we have to aim at is the Christian marriage in its fulness in which the partners would not be affected by the wound of division. There should evolve realistic measures to cater to the pastoral needs of the partners of inter-church marriage. There are chances still, for problems in 'inter-church'

<sup>(4)</sup>Hereonwards, 'inter-church' marriage, in this paper, refers to marriage between members of two autonomous Christian churches who are already in communion with each other.

marriage too. To continue in one's own church-membership and to continue the church-tradition independently, will have problems. Hence, it would be advisable to explore the ideological and practical possibility of one of the members 'adjusting' with the other in the matter of church-membership, nurturing the children etc. as an immediate expression of Christian love in marriage. Such a partner and the entire family may experience the ecumenical dimension of their family being in a situation to take communion together.

## A Select Bibliography

1. The Malta Report: Report of the joint preparatory Anglican—R.C. Commission, 1967-1968.
2. Dublin Report: International Consultation on Mixed Marriage, Dublin, 1974. (R.C., Anglican, Prot. Churches).
3. The Vatican Decree on Catholic Oriental Churches.
4. The Vatican Decree on Ecumenism.
5. *Matrimonii Sacramentum* of 18 March 1966.
6. *Motu Proprio Matrimonia Mixta* of 31 March 1970.
7. *Anglican-Roman Catholic Marriage*, the report of the Anglican R.C. International Commission on the Theology of Marriage and its application to Mixed Marriages.
8. *Final Report, Venice 1976*, Theology of Marriage and problems of Mixed Marriages; Lutheran Reformed, Roman Catholic.
9. Meyendorff, John, *Marriage: An Orthodox Perspective*, St. Vladimir's Press, New York, 1975, pp. 144.
10. Stephanopoulos, R.G., "Marriage and Family in Ecumenical Perspective", *St. Vladimir's theological quarterly*, Vol. 25, 1981-1 pp. 21-34.
11. Synodal decision of the Malankara Orthodox Church, 1976-1983.



## **TOWARDS GLOBAL PEACE WITH JUSTICE FOR ALL—ASIAN PACIFIC PERSPECTIVES**

(Revd. Dr. Christie Rosa, Sri Lanka)

The Third Asian Christian Peace Conference, attended by 80 delegates from 20 Asian and Pacific nations, met in New Delhi from 2nd to 6th October, 1989 in high expectation of new initiatives in their region, in light of the tremendous changes in the five years since the Asian CPC last met in Japan.

Messages of greeting were received from the Prime Minister of India, Rajiv Gandhi, and from many heads of churches. In a message of greeting from Bishop Dr. Karoly Toth the President of the International Christian Peace Conference, it was stressed that all those involved in international ecumenical work for peace were looking to the Asian CPC as a critical but loyal body, for new impetus for the work of the whole Christian Peace Conference.

The Conference clearly acknowledged the fact that the Asia-Pacific region will be the dominant area of world attention by the close of the 20th Century. This was emphasised in speeches given by Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios in a summary of the Asia-Pacific situation and in a precise assessment of the social, political and military realities of the region by Dr. Raja Mohan of the Indian Institute of Defence Studies and Analyses.

The religious and social situation was underlined by an inspired address by Professor Dr. Ramachandra Gandhi, grandson of the great leader Mahatma Gandhi, on "Gandhi, Religion and the Fate of the Earth". This was practically emphasised by a peace march involving thousands of school children, teachers, members of churches, clergy and Conference delegates. They marched from India Gate to Rajghat (the Memorial to Mahatma Gandhi) for a wreath-laying ceremony on the occasion of the anniversary of the Mahatma's birth.

The wider ecumenical and inter-religious nature of the Asia-Pacific region was underlined in visits to the worship centres of the various world faiths, and an inter-religious panel discussion on: "Asian Religions and Cultures—Their Role in the Struggle for a New World of Peace with Justice and for a Life-Supporting Environment". A highlight for all participants in the Conference was an invitation to join thousands of the Sikh religious community on the floor of the Gurudwara Bangla Sahib (Sikh Temple in Delhi), for a "langar" or simple communal meal.

To commemorate the centenary of his birth, a very moving testimony was paid to the life and work of the great Japanese Christian, Dr. Toyohiko Kagawa, who did so much to pioneer creative Christian involvement in the life of Japanese society. This tribute reflected the importance of the contribution of Japan as an agent for peace and economic assistance in the coming decades.

The Asian CPC recognised that the changes in the international situation, particularly the international initiatives taking place principally in the Soviet Union, would affect the whole world community. This was particularly so in respect to military alignments which in the past had been based on mistrust and the threat of conflict. These developments were seen as the first step on the long road to understanding the new thinking and new responsibilities arising from these developments. At the same time, some delegates expressed genuine concern for the continuing struggle for peace and economic justice as a result of these changes, particularly in those parts of the Asian region whose political voice is not often heard. Delegates also expressed concern about the lack of significant progress in disarmament efforts following the signing of the INF Treaty, due to many Western nations insisting on the notion of nuclear deterrence.

Participants in sub-groups had the opportunity to hear of the specific concern of various regions—the concern of Pacific peoples at the continued abuse of the environment by the USA and France by nuclear testing, of military engagement in the Government of Bangladesh, the tragedy of escalating violence in Sri Lanka, the continued bloodshed in Afghanistan as a result



of outside interference, the increasing call for the re-unification of Korea, the role of Japan in agencies devoted to aid and world banking. Participants expressed deep concern about the events in China in the first week of June, 1989, as it was a forceful oppression of a genuine non-violent movement by the Government. The Conference, however, emphasised the need not to isolate China from the international community on account of recent events. Delegates were able to participate in learning about community building ventures by visiting the Village Asola, engaging in conversations with villagers and in learning about work with the handicapped.

The Asian CPC asserted the need for more practical application to the call of the Gospel, as well as informed reflection and scientific analysis on unfolding events in the Asia-Pacific region. The peace of the whole world community and the care of the environment were critical to the future of the world. Many were concerned that if the Asian Christian community were silent there could emerge a real threat to the life of the whole world.

The Asian CPC as it met in New Delhi dedicated itself anew to the task of peace with justice for all the people of the Asia-Pacific region. Both a personal and corporate dedication to this task were considered essential for all those who participated in the journey for peace in the light of the Christian Gospel.

Delegates also expressed their appreciation for the possibility to participate in a public meeting to inform the wider community of the findings of the Conference, to participate in a cultural evening, to share in a further meal with the Sikh Community hosted by the Guru Nanak Foundation and for a delegation being received by His Excellency, Dr. S. D. Sharma, the Vice-President of India.

The International CPC was represented at the meeting by its Secretary General Dr. Lubomír Mirejovsky; Deputy Secretary General Rev. Christoph Schmauch; Archbishop Sergei, a member of the CPC Working Committee; and Rev. Míla Hradečná, a member of the International Secretariat.

Thanks were expressed for the hospitality of all the churches and organisations who assisted in the hosting of the Conference, particularly Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios and the Community of the Delhi Orthodox Centre.

The Asian CPC elected a new Executive Committee of T. S. Hirayama, Japan (President); Rev. Y. Toeda, Japan, Mr. D. Melville, India, Dr Ch Rosa, Sri Lanka, Ms. Mira Phailbus, Pakistan, Rev. James Udy, Australia (Vice-Presidents); Metropolitan Paulos Mar Gregorios, India, Rev. Alan Brash, New Zealand, Mrs. Sosamma Thampy, India (Honorary Presidents); Prof. K. V. Paulose, India (Secretary General); Rev. Akuila Yabaki, Fiji and Rev. Isaac Baroi, Bangladesh (Assistant Secretaries General); Ms. Nobuko Otsuka, Japan (treasurer) as Members of the Asian CPC Executive, to undertake the work on behalf of the wider body until the meeting of the 4th Asian Christian Peace Conference.

In the letter addressed to the Churches in Asia and the Pacific the participants in the meeting—where believers of other faiths were also present—expressed the conviction that *"the biblical imperative is for us Christians to reach out to all people particularly at the grass-roots level, to say No to all forms of injustice, national and international. The action of the churches should be to help the poor and encourage the disheartened and bring together people of all faiths and creeds to work together towards a just society for all."* The letter continues:

*"We challenge the churches to build ways of solidarity in Asia and the Pacific, to be alert, have an enquiring attitude, speak out and act on any matters and issues of injustice."*

*"We heard at this conference of the struggles of the people of the Pacific against nuclear testing and their efforts to put a stop to the dumping of nuclear waste in the Pacific ocean and how these have endangered the people who depend on the sea for their livelihood. We therefore support the South Pacific Nuclear-Free Zone Treaty 1985, and must make every effort to work towards a nuclear-free zone in the Pacific and the Indian Ocean and thus ultimately establish a zone of peace. Further-*



*more, we urge the churches to act in favour of the immediate and total abolition of nuclear and other weapons of mass annihilation.*

*"We also pray that in your church you will take initiatives aimed at encouraging people to adopt new thinking and responsibilities based on our Asian culture so that your church can reshape the future in the light to the redemptive gospel of Jesus Christ.*

*"We call upon all churches and Christians to work more actively and intensify their efforts for Peace and Justice in every situation, trusting in Him who says "Behold I make all things new", to guide and direct our paths in the ways of Peace".*

## STATEMENT

### THIRD ASIAN CHRISTIAN PEACE CONFERENCE, DELHI ORTHODOX CENTRE

New Delhi—October 2-6, 1989.

We have gathered together here in New Delhi, 80 people from some 20 countries mostly in the Asia-Pacific region, to reflect together on "Global Peace With Justice for All—Asian-Pacific Perspectives" at the Third Asian Christian Peace Conference held at the Delhi Orthodox Centre from October 2nd to 6th 1989.

#### 1. The Perspective

Our perspective demanded that we look at the globe with the vast Pacific Ocean, rather than the Atlantic Ocean, in the centre forefront. We did not ignore any part of the globe or overlook any group of humanity. With the Pacific and the Indian Oceans facing us we saw our humanity in a new perspective. We saw the vast majority of the world's people living amidst and around these two oceans. We saw also the wealth of the world in this region—oil and minerals, coal and gas, 80% of its diamonds, 93% of its jute, of its uranium, 77% of all natural rubber, 76% of all tea.

But we saw also in the Asia-Pacific Region a huge concentration of nuclear missiles and warheads, nuclear powered and nuclear armed submarines and ships. We saw that the warheads from the dismantled or destroyed INF Treaty land-based missiles were being deployed in our oceans. The battle-ground is shifting again to our waters, as it had shifted since the second world war from Europe to Asia. We remember with horror the terrible wars in Asia—the Korean war, the Vietnam war, the Kampuchean genocide, the Iraq-Iran war, the Afghan war, and scores of other wars fought on Asian soil, killing millions of our people and fattening the purses of death-dealers and arms-traders elsewhere.



We saw that major nuclear naval battles can now be fought in the Pacific and Indian Oceans; there are so many missiles and warheads here in these waters—enough to destroy the world many times over.

Facing us at the centre of this three million square miles of the Pacific waters we saw the 2000 little islands—small, isolated, without power to defend themselves from other people's military interests and from other people's nuclear tests. Some of them are still colonies of western nations. All are small and need the world community to defend and support them.

We saw also the North Pacific Big Four—big in terms of their military and economic might: U.S.A., U.S.S.R., Japan and China, three of them nuclear powers, the fourth potentially so. They are also in competition with each other for markets and minerals.

We saw the scores of other nations along the two oceans—many of them populous like Indonesia, Philippines, India, Pakistan and Bangladesh, just these five countries having a population far exceeding one billion. The Arab countries, The Asian African and Latin American maritime countries bordering on the two oceans, Australia, New Zealand, the Pacific Islands, Indian Ocean Islands like Srilanka and Madagascar, we can confidently say that 80% of the world's population live near to the Pacific and Indian Oceans.

We would not exclude the rest of humanity from our essentially global perspective—the Atlantic nations of Europe, Western Africa, and parts of South America. But fixing our eyes on the Pacific and Indian Ocean at the centre, we saw the globe and our human race in a fresh perspective.

## 2. The Inter-Religious Perspective

Meeting here in New Delhi we were constantly exposed to other religions. We had Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs and Buddhists to address us, and we visited the places of worship of other religions. We saw that the Christian community here, as in most other Asian countries, was a small minority. If the problems of

the world like war and militarism, the injustice of cultural and economic oppression and exploitation, and a frightening degree of environmental pollution and disruption, were to be adequately tackled, we need to work shoulder to shoulder with our brothers and sisters of other religions or no religion. We saw how dialogue and co-operation with people of other faiths can inspire us and instruct us. We experienced here in Delhi the warm and moving hospitality and *fellowship* of our Muslim and Sikh brothers and sisters.

Euro-centric thinking, though spread all over the globe, is essentially narrow and parochial. We in Asia have a heritage that is rich, but which fails to be fully shared in by Christians. European-American dualistic thinking (subject-object, matter-spirit, nature-history, grace-works) stands behind our scientific-technological culture as well as Christian understanding, and accounts for many of their ills.

It is important for Christians in Asia to develop more creative ways of thinking and acting, rather than merely criticize the western thought in which our elite has been brought up. Our own new thinking has to be global and positive—not parochially Asian or negative towards other cultures. Christians now alienated from Asian cultures should seek to recover their heritage in dialogue with people of other religions and of no religion.

80% of the world's population belong to the various religions of the world. Only 20% profess secular ideologies and creeds. A global humanism that is *a priori* anti-religious cannot touch the globe's human beings where they are. A false secularism which holds that the world open to our senses is the whole of reality, seems an essential element in the now spreading scientific technological culture. The springs of creativity for a global programme for global redemption cannot be found, except in dialogue with other religions.

## *New Thinking - New Responsibilities*

New Thinking has now become a technical term. It refers to the global humanistic approaches opened up in the Soviet Union,



which rightly emphasize the unity of humanity, the peaceful settlement of national and international conflicts, the total elimination of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction, co-operation in science, technology and culture by people of differing ideological and socio-economic systems, co-existence and co-operation to promote disarmament, development, and protection of the environment. This New Thinking has released forces and produced proposals to lessen international tension and to create a new detente all over the world. The signing and on-going implementation of the INF treaty is indeed a historic first fruit of the detente. We hope that the second step of a 50% reduction in the strategic nuclear weaponry of the two leading nuclear powers will be taken this year. We also look forward to the next steps—the drastic reduction of conventional weapons and forces, the signing and ratification of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and eventually a total freeze on manufacture and deployment of nuclear weapons leading to their total elimination and illegalisation.

New Thinking can lead to these and other necessary steps towards the building up of a system of Comprehensive Global Common Security. There is little likelihood of that happening if the New Thinking is interpreted by advocates of the market economy system as a sign of the collapse and discomfiture of socialism. Capitalist triumphalism welcomes Soviet New Thinking with a condescending air of superiority, which attitude is as offensive as it is based on a mis-understanding. New Thinking seeks to redeem socialism from some of its historically developed undemocratic and violent methods of operation, which do not belong to socialism as such. New thinking seeks to promote human rights and human creativity.

And yet we cannot, as a Christian Peace Movement ignore some of the serious criticisms levelled against New Thinking, *Perestroika* and *Glasnost*, not by capitalists, but by those with a firm socialist commitment. In the Christian Peace Conference we should engage in serious and informed reflection on these questions :

- (a) Does the new Global humanist approach marginalize the fundamental notions of class conflict and class struggle?

- (b) Does a socialist system compromise itself when it introduces into it private ownership of means of production and the profit motive? Does it pave the way for its own downfall by letting the Trojan horse of a private sector inside it?
- (c) Does the shift from confrontation to co-operation with capitalism mean that the working classes of non-socialist countries, as well as smaller socialist nations cannot count on the principle of global socialist solidarity, and on the role of the first socialist state to defend emerging socialist states from being devoured by capitalist predators?
- (d) By weakening the role of the Party in running the system, in the name of democratic checks and controls, does socialism expose itself to the risk of being waylaid by populist elements manipulated by shrewd forces which desire the downfall of socialism?

No question can be taboo in the Christian Peace Movement. We want the churches and regional groups to undertake a fresh assessment of New Thinking in the Soviet Union, carefully weighing its positive and negative features.

### 3. Naval Disarmament

We were told by our well-informed speakers that while the focus of nuclear confrontation shifts to the Pacific and Indian Oceans, the disarmament talks are not included on their agenda. If 16 to 20 thousand nuclear weapons are in the oceans of the world, the removal or reduction of land-based intermediate range or strategic nuclear weapons only shifts the immediate danger of the outbreak of a nuclear conflict from European earth to Asian African waters. This cannot be tolerated. Asia has seen Nagasaki and Hiroshima. No other continent has had that experience.

There must be a concerted effort to include Naval Disarmament as a top priority for action; for while land-based nuclear weapons, which are already obsolete and vulnerable due to



developments in electronic guidance systems, become reduced, there is vertical proliferation of nuclear weapons in our waters. The voice of humanity must be raised in unison to stop this process.

#### 4. Regional Conflicts

Living in a region where conflicts have been perennial, we listened to agonising tales of human cruelty and violence from many regions of the Asia-Pacific.

Thanks to the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, we had hoped that a just and peaceful national reconciliation would take place in that land. Weapons continue to flow in to the Mujahiddeen. Outside forces bent on profit and power seem determined to prevent the Afghan people from finding their own peaceful settlement of issues. The Geneva Agreements on non-interference and non-intervention are brazenly violated. Civilians in Afghan cities are subjected to indiscriminate rocketing and economic blockade. Innocent Women and children suffer and die.

The lesson that military solutions do not work seems yet unknown to some. There is no military solution to the Afghan question. Only negotiation in a spirit of understanding, conciliation and balance of interests can bring lasting solutions. Peace will come to Afghanistan when all Afghans can confer together without outside interference and without the supply of weapons from outside.

The unfortunate division of Korea continues as a sore wound in the body of Asia. While there are encouraging attempts to reduce tension between the South and the North, there are factors seeking to obstruct reconciliation and reunification.

The presence of massive U.S. forces and nuclear weapons on South Korean soil seems the major obstruction. Withdrawal of these forces and weapons and the signing of a peace agreement between the U.S.A. and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea seems the first step needed. There should also be a non-aggression pact between South Korea and North Korea.

Three principles of independence peace and national unity should guide the formation of a unified Democratic Confederal Republic of Korea (Koryo), which allows different ideologies and economic systems in fruitful co-operation and co-existence.

In South Korea, church leaders who sincerely work for reunification are often imprisoned and tortured. We demand the immediate release from prison and persecution of Revd. Moon IK Huan, Father Moon Gyu Hyon Paul, and Ms Rim Su Gyon Susan.

(appreciated)



## CHANGING CONTOURS OF SOCIALISM

(Paul Gregorios)

"We talk of a Welfare State and of democracy and of socialism. They are good concepts, but they hardly convey a clear and unambiguous meaning... Democracy and socialism are means to an end, not the end itself... The touchstone, therefore, should be how far any political or social theory enables the individual to rise above his petty self and thus think in terms of the good of all. The law of life should not be competition or acquisitiveness, but co-operation, the good of each contributing to the good of all. In such a society the emphasis will be on duties, not on rights; the rights will follow the performance of duties. We have to give a new direction to education and evolve a new type of humanity".

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru-1958

Nehru said that in his article on "The Basic Approach" written for the A I C C Economic Review, 1 more than forty years ago.

Though first enamoured of socialism as established in 1917 in the Soviet Union, Nehru later became more critical of it. The "Basic Approach" article, resulting from a private group discussion in which Nehru took part, accuses Communism of the espousal of violence and the suppression of individual freedom. Nehru also expresses guarded admiration for the achievements of Capitalism because of the greater flourishing of democracy within it.

Today in both the Soviet Union and in the Peoples' Republic of China, socialist systems are undergoing substantial changes. Among these changes, perhaps the most important is the willingness to incorporate certain aspects of the market economy into a socialist system. The main difference between China and the

Soviet Union is in the degree of importance each gives to democracy. Both the Chinese and the Soviet systems have been "command economies", centrally administered, riddled with bureaucracy, and allowing little room for the democratic exercise of criticism and dissent.

If the Tiananmen Square incident of June 3rd and 4th, 1989 had not intervened, there was a possibility of greater democratic development in China, but for the present, old style repression seems to dominate the political economy. A similar, though smaller repression occurred in the U.S.S.R two months earlier, but the consequences have been different. On April 7th and 8th, 1989 there was a massive protest demonstration in the square before the government headquarters in Tbilisi, the capital of the Georgian Republic. The two demonstrations, though different in magnitude and demands, do show the common features of cleverly executed destabilisation techniques. In Georgia too, there was severe repression of the demonstration, firing into the crowds by troops, resulting in loss of scores of lives.

The difference lay in this—it has now become clear that the Georgian repression did not have the approval of the chief leader. It now transpires that it was the Soviet Defence Minister Dmitry Razov who appointed Col-General Igor Rodionov to take over military control of the city, and it was Rodionov in collusion with the Georgian Communist Party First Secretary Patiashvili, who ordered the massacre. In China, Deng Tsiao-Ping publicly congratulated the P L A officers who carried out the Tiananmen massacre. In the Soviet Union, Rodionov was immediately replaced by the Defence Minister and Patiashvili resigned. Neither Georgi Razumovski nor Viktor Chebrikov, (former K G B chief) the two Politburo members handling the Georgian problem in Moscow had ordered the repression. Gorbachov apologized and sent Shevernadze to conciliate the masses.

There are two new forces seeking to change the violent and dictatorial methods of Communist Society—Democratisation and Economic Reform. In the Soviet Union they are called *Glasnost*



and *Perestroika*, and are regarded as integral to each other. In China Democratisation is not even accepted in principle. The issue of economic reform has been controversial in China, ever since its initiation in 1978.

I remember my visit to China in 1986 and my long conversation with Peng Zhen, then Chairman of the National Peoples' Congress. He surprised me by telling me that the N.P.C. had made two important decisions that week (April 1986): (a) to stop all new economic reform; and (b) to go slow on economic reforms then in process. The N.P.C. had in 1979 decided on the four modernisations, and since this seemed to me to be going back on that decision, I asked Peng Zhen why. He told me that at first they thought that the cultural consequences of inviting foreign TNC's to operate on the periphery of Chinese territory would not invade or affect the whole mainland. The N.P.C. found out that the whole of China was now affected—bribery, corruption, drugs, illegal foreign exchange deals, hoarding, black-market and all the rest of the evils of capitalism had entered the political economy.

Well, somehow, the NPC decision was not carried out and Peng Zhen was soon out of power (He was Number Two after Deng Xiao Ping in 1986). He has now come back centre stage since the Tiananmen event.

But the Chinese have carried out economic reform effectively; the standard of living has tripled in some areas in ten years (1978-88). And by 1988 China was willing to sing the praises of Capitalism. During my third visit to China in December 1988, I found smugness and complacency about the market economy introduced in 1979. The *Beijing Review*, China's official weekly magazine of November 14-20, 1988 had an article on "Reunderstanding Capitalism" by Xu Jiatun, the Hong Kong Bureau Chief of the official Xinhua News Agency. The article stated clearly that previous socialist critiques of capitalism were one-sided and mistaken, and that capitalism was essential to the growth of productive forces even in a socialist economy. "We should and must learn from capitalism and inherit all the outstanding cultural achievements of human history.....Without the cultural

heritage of capitalism, there would be not socialism (*sic*). Socialism can never cut its historical and present ties with capitalism and succeed by isolating itself from the development of world history".

This point of view that socialism should not fight capitalism but domesticate it and benefit from it has been largely accepted by the Soviet leadership also, though they may not put it that way. But the role of Hong Kong as the Chinese envisage it, is crucial. The Chinese have developed the philosophy, for the post-1997 period, of "One country, two systems". The Soviets also seem to be moving in that direction. The Xu Jiatun article says plainly: "Hong Kong will practise capitalism for at least 50 years after returning to the motherland in 1997. At the same time, China will be able to expand its economic and trade relations with the capitalist world via Hong Kong. This will not only be conducive to Hong Kong's prosperity and development, but also benefit our socialist construction".<sup>3</sup>

It is not totally idle to speculate whether at least in the minds of some Soviet leaders, there is the thought that the Baltic republics may eventually serve as a Soviet Hong Kong; i.e. as a link with the capitalist world, a capitalist unit within the Soviet Union.

Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania together have a population of 8 millions, comparable to Hong Kong's 6 millions. It is possible that the three Baltic republics would both integrate themselves with the world market economy and at the same time stay within the Soviet Union as an independent political-economic unit, on the analogy of Hong Kong. The other option is for these states to be "finlandized", i.e. become capitalist nations, but friendly with the Soviet Union.

Why does socialism want such capitalist units within a socialist system? There are two obvious reasons. The first is a recognition in Chinese and Soviet socialist leadership circles that developed capitalism is, as Marx-Engels taught, a necessary precondition to the emergence of a fully socialist economy. An advanced system of machine production, with a high rate



of science-technology development accelerating the socialisation of labour as well as the emancipation of labour from its primitive-rural inhibitions, is regarded as necessary condition for the emergence of socialism. Equally necessary, they now say, is a developed credit or banking system which enables universalisation of the big-machine based production system. Along with that, the joint stock system of shared capital and a highly developed management techniques are considered prerequisites for the emergence of socialism.

Marx said that "the banking system possesses indeed the form of universal book-keeping and distribution of means of production on a social scale".<sup>4</sup> Lenin in his turn stated that "the big banks are the 'state apparatus' which we need to bring about socialism, and which we take *ready-made* from capitalism".<sup>5</sup>

Both in China and in the Soviet Union there is a growing sense that there can be no transition from feudalism to socialism without passing through capitalism. Since both socialist economies did not have a sufficiently developed capitalist past, they are now striving to introduce some aspects of the market economy system into a socialist system at this late stage.

The classical Marxist theory has been that the machine-based production system, the accelerated Scientific-Technological Revolution (STR), the sophisticated banking, credit and finance system, and the efficient management system coupled with a highly trained labour force would not only provide the prerequisites for socialism; it would also at the same time develop sufficient degree of contradictions within the capitalist mode of production as to force the emergence of the socialist mode of production which alone can take care of the social organisation of large scale production. This classical theory had been kept in abeyance both in China and in the Soviet Union. Now it is being taken out of storage and dusted up to fit the new needs a stagnant socialist economy.

The other reasons to have some capitalism inside socialism may be the hope that if there are western interests inside socialist countries they may not resort to nuclear destruction of these

countries—destruction which they might otherwise be tempted to effect.

The present writer has serious doubts as to whether this lop-sided way of putting capitalism inside socialism will work at all. We have seen in China and the Soviet Union the enormous bundle of contradictions that this lop-sided path throws up. China has created many millionnaires in the last 5 years, thanks to the introduction of the private sector of production. The Soviet Union has done so in two years, as we will illustrate below. Both in China and in the Soviet Union bribery and corruption have become rampant; the black market has grown enormously and tax evasion runs into multi-millions. Hoarding, foreign exchange rackets, parasitism and other capitalist contradictions have now come within the socialist economy. Above all the inflation rate has shot up and unemployment has increased. A criminal 'mafia' has also emerged.

It is at this point that the wisdom of Pandit Nehru's words cited at the beginning come to light in a new way. If the essence of socialism is enabling "the individual to rise above his petty self and thus think in terms of the good of all", this is certainly not what is happening in the Soviet Union and China as a result of the economic reforms introduced.

\* \* \*

For the present writer it was a great shock indeed to come face to face with the view of Andrei Fedorov, Chairman of the Union of Moscow Cooperatives. I put my question to him (in August 1989) the following way :

"Mr. Fedorov, I have heard two different points of view about Soviet Co-operatives. Most people I have talked to do not like them. They say co-operatives are bandits charging the consumer exorbitant prices for low quality goods and exploiting them in an unsocialist way; they also make commodities rare in the market by buying them up in bulk. On the other hand I have also heard the other viewpoint that the co-operatives have a tough time even in getting a plot of ground or a basement in a



building to start their production; have difficulty in procuring manufacturing equipment and raw materials; have to bribe officials and pay black market prices for what they need. What is your experience?"

Andrei seemed excited by my question. He is a pioneer in co-operatives in the Soviet Union, and now elected head of the association of the 11,500 cooperatives in Moscow, employing some 300,000 persons. (Only 7500 Moscow co-operatives are really in operation; 4000 are merely registered, waiting for site, equipment etc). The Soviet Union now has 145,000 co-operatives employing 2.5 million workers. The Moscow Co-operatives' turnover rose from 22 million roubles in 1987 to 830 million in 1988. 1989 figures are expected to be double that; by 1990 it is estimated to rise to 2.2 billion roubles—9% of total Moscow production.

Mr. Fedorov left us for a few minutes to seat some important guests who had arrived in his restaurant. He came back to our table ten minutes later and gave me an "interesting" (to put it mildly) point of view :

"We do not compete with state organisations, because they cannot compete with us. They are rule-run. If they had the same rights as cooperatives, the prices would come down.

"We do not know what socialism is nor do we know capitalism. The name does not matter. What did Marx want? What did Lenin want? They wanted people to eat well and live happily.

"Our co-operative began with something like 300 roubles as capital. Today we have a board of 13 people with an investment of 2000 roubles each. In two years we have managed to own three restaurants, a computer shop and an information centre. We employ some 300 people.

"Because of non-availability of raw materials, we have had to start our own farm, piggery, sausage factory and brewery and bakery. Our assets today are worth about 8.5 million roubles

and 2 million U.S. dollars in hard currency. I am on my way tomorrow to Spain to start a Russian restaurant in Barcelona".

I asked the innocent question about the future of socialism. He seemed to lose his poise at that point, and burst out in a torrent of words; I give only excerpts below :

"For 70 years we had socialism. What Lenin wanted was a society of rich and happy people. What do we have now? Only Party people are rich. Power and wealth are the monopoly of State ministers and party bureaucrats. Where are the workers? They earn about 160 roubles a month and drink cheap vodka to drown their miseries. The Party and the State saw to it that they got their cheap vodka, so that they can forget. If they misbehaved, the police handled them. And so a strong police regime became part of the outfit

"Look at me. I have been working for 30 years now, 25 of which was in the restaurant business. I rose to the near-top; I became manager of a large Intourist restaurant employing 400 people, and with an annual turnover of over 7 million roubles. We made foreign currency profit of 1.5 million dollars a year for the State. How much did I get? 190 roubles a month; after deductions a take-home pay of 160 roubles! I have a wife and two children. My wife worked too, at a T.V. station. She got 130 roubles a month. So we had 290 roubles a month on which a family has to live. To maintain the standard of life appropriate for my position, I needed five times that much. Well, I managed to get what I needed. I took bribes from everyone possible. I robbed the restaurant.

"A hundred million people working in state enterprises are doing that. (The state bureaucracy is only 18 million people, but never mind, P.G.) everybody is robbing where he can. The driver of a state car steals petrol and sells it to others. He does his own part time job during his official working hours. People running shops are robbing the goods. All government officials take bribes. 80% of the country is robbing each other. Everybody keeps silence. The big Police force and the K.G.B. are also in the same business. That is socialism for you.



"Gradually we became used to the system and even liked it. The big robber sometimes got caught and was put in jail. Small swindlers could always go free.

"The co-operatives came into this kind of a socialist society. We worked hard and started making big money. All co-operative workers cannot be honest, because they are children of the system, after all. Lot of the black money in the country got invested in the cooperatives. There is no income reporting and taxation system in the country. So the shadow economy keeps growing. Only 70,000 people manage the tax system in the country. In the U.S.A. the N.R.S. employs 1.6 million people. Tax evasion by bribery is still practised by the co-operatives. If they tax us properly, how will they get the bribes?

"I pay 17% tax on my profits. Soon I will have to pay 30%. I have to pay bribes and I have to pay also the Mafia. Co-operatives are no solution. What we need is a private sector that is vigorous and strong. What we need is a new Stalin—to take us back to capitalism. The people will cry for it soon".

I am not suggesting that all Soviet people think and talk like Andrei Fedorov. He is a typical capitalist. The fact, however, is significant that in all socialist countries there is a substantial group of people who are convinced that socialism is a total failure and that capitalism is the only viable alternative.

Lech Welesa has stated that his nation is now marching on an untrodden path—namely the transition from socialism to capitalism. While one may question the assertion that it is socialism that Poland had before, one can appreciate the candor with which Lech Welesa and the Polish Catholic Church is re-sponsing capitalism. But will it be capitalism pure and simple? And what about Hungary? Despite the fact that deep loyalty to socialism is but a thin veneer at the top, Hungary has established a socialist structure of society much more than Poland had. If it now opens out more to the west, it will be only to build a 'mixed' and not a purely capitalist economy.

There are people who think that socialism has completely collapsed. In too many countries it was established through war or violence and not by a peoples' revolution. The socialist international, which held the system together, has indeed virtually collapsed. The world socialist system was a development of the Forties and Fifties—Bulgaria (1944), Poland (1945), Czechoslovakia (1948), German Democratic Republic (1949), Peoples' Republic of China (1949), Romania (1947), Hungary (1947), Yugoslavia (1945), Albania (1947), Vietnam (1945), Laos (1954), Kampuchea (1954), D.P.R. Korea (1948) and Outer Mongolia. Cuba and Ethiopia were latecomers to the socialist family, arriving in 1959 and 1974/76 respectively.

The split between U.S.S.R and China delayed the consolidation of socialist internationalism. Albania also opted out of the socialist international community and started ploughing its lonely furrough. In 1949 the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) was formed with Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Poland and the U.S.S.R as founder members. G D R joined in 1950, Mongolia in 1962, Cuba in 1972, Vietnam in 1978. The CMEA not only attempted a measure of socialist economic integration and scientific-technological cooperation; it made possible the use of Soviet military power to resist internal and external attempts to topple the socialist governments—in Hungary in 1956, in Czechoslovakia in 1968, in D.P.R. Korea in 1950, in Poland in 1956 and in the eighties, in Cuba in 1961, and in the G D R in 1948-49, 1953 and 1961; in Vietnam for quarter of a century.

It is this Soviet military support for socialist regimes that has now come to an end, with the transition from the Brezhnev era to the Gorbachov era. Socialist countries are now free to leave the socialist fold and join the capitalist world, as far as soviet military Power is concerned.

This does change the contour of socialism substantially. Of course the People's Republic of China was only for a short period dependent on soviet military power. But nearly all the others were. Socialist regimes are now forced to look to their own people rather than to the Soviet Union for basic support. This is what



made the Polish transition possible, and may permit others in the near future.

The withdrawal of Soviet military power from the defence of the world socialist system is bound to have momentous historical consequences—for humanity as a whole as well as for the future of socialism. A new socialism, “with a human face”, democratic, not based on violence and repression, depending largely on the social commitment of ordinary citizens, is on the rise. However at present the picture is indeed confused, due to the introduction of capitalism inside socialism by the two major socialist countries—China and the U.S.S.R.

### The Question of Ideology

The aversion in Marxist intellectual circles to discuss basic ideology is not new. Most Marxists are content to begin with an analysis of the class character of society and the doctrine of class conflict as fundamentals of Marxist ideology. Marxist philosophers, however, have the need to go back to more fundamental questions like

- (a) On what foundation do Marxists philosophize and act?
- (b) What is reality like?
- (c) How do we find out, reliably?
- (d) What is the right course of action?

Since the New Thinking came into fashion in Soviet circles around 1985, the notion of Class Struggle is subordinated to the notion of Global Humanism. This brought the “doctrine of humanity” or philosophical anthropology into the centre of the discussion. In connection with the 18th World Philosophical Congress (Brighton, U.K. August 1988), Soviet philosophers produced a series of monographs on the subject of “Man”. Contributing to the discussion, Academicians P. Fedoseyev, A. Aganbegyan, I.T. Frolov, T. Oizerman, E. Velikhov, and others produced several volumes of writings.<sup>6</sup> But in all this literature one misses any discussion of the foundational ontological questions. The nearest they approach the foundations is in relation to a doctrine of man.

For Marx, Man-woman is a sensuous being with passions and impulses as well as social relations—an active natural being in interaction with nature and with each other.<sup>7</sup> Man/woman is a *bio-social* being, the subject of the *historical* process, genetically linked to other forms of life, but standing apart as a *conscious*, *tool-making*, *social-linguistic*, *reasoning*, *being*. According to the *Dictionary of Philosophy* edited by Ivan Timofievich Frolov (Progress Publishers, Moscow, Second revised edition, 1984):

“The Man of the future will be a reasonable, humane, wondering and active (being), capable of appreciating beauty, full of integrity, (an) all round developed personality, an embodiment of all essential human powers combined, of spiritual and physical perfection”<sup>8</sup>

Philosophical Marxism in the Soviet Union still adheres to the principle of “historical, dialectical materialism”. All three words have their ideological significance.

Philosophical materialism holds that the “material” is primary, and the “spiritual” or “ideal” secondary. This way of thinking is characteristic of German and French thought of the European Enlightenment. The distinction between matter and spirit, however, has become increasingly problematic in modern theoretical physics for two reasons: (a) matter and energy are mutually convertible, in terms of the famous formula of Einstein:  $E = MC^2$ , where energy is equal to mass multiplied by the square of the speed of light; and (b) matter itself is now seen to be composed, not of material particles, but of charges of energy in perpetual motion and inter-action.

Lenin in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* sought to refute the thesis that the new discoveries in physics refuted materialism. He identified the thought of the physicists as ‘physical idealism’, which denied the objectivity of the world and the objectivity of knowledge. Lenin was concerned that the denial of materialism would inevitably impede scientific progress by bringing in idealist-mystical distortions of reality and promoting irrationality. The struggle against the religious view of the world was an integral part, he claimed, of the struggle against



the reactionary social thought of the bourgeoisie. His 1922 article "On the Significance of Militant Materialism" advanced the thesis that only the theory of historical-dialectical materialism would provide an adequate scientific basis for knowing the laws of social development and for the principles of revolutionary struggle for the socialist transformation of society

Marxist philosophers today have great difficulty in defending this thesis of Lenin; but they seldom openly question it. It is difficult not to recognize the philosophy of dialectical materialism as historically and culturally conditioned

There is no valid philosophical justification for the hypothesis that the world is material, self-existent and self-developing.

What Lenin was fighting was some current Franco-German affirmations about "super-natural essence" or transcendent realities, which he feared would be used by the reactionaries to resist social progress. The dichotomy between matter and "spirit" itself is philosophically questionable; the statement that "matter" exists as "objective reality" outside and independent of consciousness, has no scientific basis. Equally dogmatic is the affirmation that matter is "eternal in time and infinite in space", the assumption about the "objective" character of time and space are also difficult to justify.

Philosophically speaking Marxist-Leninist ideology has an ontology and an epistemology which are at best articles of faith for those who live within a certain cultural tradition. The ontological affirmations that matter-energy is all that exists, that it exists independently of human cognition, and that it can be faithfully reflected in human consciousness, all may seem self-evident to people brought up in that tradition; but they lack scientific-philosophical justification.

The polemic of Marx, Engels and Lenin against prevailing Germanic modes of idealistic thought can be understood and accepted in a large measure. Such critique is still necessary for exposing the falsity of idealist claims. But in themselves, as positive affirmations, the axia of marxist ideology can only be

accorded the status of a particular tradition, which will need to face continuous dialogue with and criticism from other traditions.

Marxists all over the world still struggling for emancipation from unjust and exploitative societies worry about the Soviet Union's relegating the Class Struggle to the margin of concern. Of course the Soviet Union has largely eliminated the feudal and capitalist exploiting classes. For them class confrontation risks a nuclear holocaust, and therefore in the interests of survival, they play it down. Other marxists cannot follow this path. They know that survival is a prominent issue. But they are not ready to set aside the class struggle for the sake of survival. Thus a cleavage in Marxist socialism develops.

Socialism, in Marxist thought, is a social system (not a set of ideas), which comes into being as a result of a socialist revolution in which the working classes take over power from the bourgeoisie; it is a transitional stage in social development from feudalism through capitalism to communism. It implied, at least till recently, (a) the struggle against the profit motive as incentive to production and its replacement by social commitment and motivation; (b) the public ownership of the means of production; and (c) the elimination of the exploiter classes and systems of exploitation.

Whether these three principles are still accepted and practised by socialist systems has now come in question. Therein lies a major crisis in the process of human social development. Socialism grows more human when it abjures oppression, struggles against inefficiency and stagnation, and promotes human freedom and democratic processes. When it compromises the three principles mentioned above—that is another matter.

### Changing Attitudes to Religion

Another changing aspect of Marxist ideology in China and the Soviet Union relates to the issue of religion and atheism. I remember very well what Peng Zhen said to me in 1986: "There is a difference between Soviet Union's Atheism and Chinese



Atheism. We are both atheists, but Chinese atheism is not anti-religious".

This may have been true in 1986, but things have changed in the Soviet Union. Atheistic anti-religious propaganda has become toned down. It was always lacking in great intellectual sophistication, resorting mostly to dishonest caricature and basically uninformed invective.

The journal 'Science and Religion' was one of the main instruments of this propaganda; its circulation kept going down to a few thousands. Recently a brand new, cultured team of editors have taken over the journal, and it suddenly became interesting to intellectuals. I had dinner with the Deputy Chief Editor of the journal, and surprising to me, his views completely coincided with mine, in the matter of relation between religious believers and people of secular atheist convictions. He said both belong to humanity and it is a waste of effort for the two sides to argue and quarrel. It is much more important to *co-operate for the good of humanity*.

The journal now publishes articles from religious people also, and there is a healthy debate going on in its columns, I was told. I wish such a debate between secular and religious people could be carried on in my country.

So many thousands of worship places have now been opened up by the state in 1988-89—something like 2000 churches, several hundred mosques and Buddhist temples. During the Millennium of the Baptism of Russ in 1988 Swami Lokeshvarananda of the Ramakrishna Mutt in Calcutta met with secular Indologist Academician Yevgeny Chelishev, and this led to the formation of the Vivekananda Society in the Soviet Union. The Institute of Oriental Studies of the Soviet Academy of Sciences has begun publishing a 20-volume series of Indian "spiritual" works of the Twentieth Century, with a foreword from Mikhail Gorbachov. Similarly an English 20-volume series of Russian spiritual classics of the 20th century, with Foreword from Rajiv Gandhi, began coming out in 1987 (6 volumes have come out so far).

The Lenin Soviet-Children's Fund and the Soviet Charity Association have been recently set up as voluntary organisations massively supported by church finances. Mother Teresa was invited to start relief and counselling operations in hospitals and old people's homes. When she came, she was received by Prime Minister Ryzhkov himself.

We from the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches were graciously received at the Kremlin by Prime Minister Ryzhkov, who apologized to the churches for mistreating and discriminating against religious believers in the past. He assured us that a new law on Religious Practice would be adopted by the Supreme Soviet in 1989, guaranteeing non-discrimination and full citizenship rights to religious believers.

There have been two factors leading to this. For sometime some of us have been taunting Soviet Academicians and intellectuals with the question whether universal assessment of religion in a scientific socialism could be based on Marx's 19th century dicta based on his study of European religion in his time. Most people agreed that a Marxist approach to religion could not be based on any dogma or dicta, but must be solidly based on an empirical study of religion as it is currently practised all over the wide world.

A second argument, again advanced publicly (in a Bolshoi Theatre meeting with many members of the Politburo present, in 1988) by the present writer, was based on the fundamental global-humanistic orientation of *perestroika-glasnost*. In a world where 80% of the people belong to various religions and those of secular persuasion are not more than 20%, how can a global-humanistic approach start out with pre-conceived anti-religious dogmas? It is now fairly widely recognized in Marxist circles in Eastern Europe and Cuba that such anti-religious dogmatism on the part of Socialism is counter-productive and not ideologically justified. This may not be the case in India where dogmatism is stronger. In any case, one of the fundamental changes in the contours of socialism seems to be in a correction of the previous totally negative attitude towards religion. There is a growing conviction among Marxist intellectuals that it may be wrong to regard



atheism and anti-religious dogmatism as essential aspects of Marxist socialism.

### Three Aberrations

In the Soviet Union the current argument is that it is a mistake to assume that the contours of socialism that have emerged in the Soviet Union during the past 50 years is in any way normative. They now argue that three of the major developments were unsocialistic—the undemocratic role of the Party, state ownership of the means of production and the command economy. These are points to ponder, also for parties outside the Soviet Union.

### The Party

The Party, they argue, was not meant by Lenin to assume management of the political economy, as if they were the sole agents for the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. In Lenin's perception the major decision-making and management powers were to be vested in the Congress of Workers' Deputies and in the Supreme Soviet elected by them. Because of the Stalinist deviation, the Party and the Politburo usurped their functions. The Party, in Lenin's thought, was meant only to exercise over-all guidance and direction—not direct management of the economy. Of course this poses a problem for those communist parties which have not yet captured the seat of political-economic power, for example in a country like India. There must be democratic control of the Party by its own membership and cadres. This does not take place in the Indian Communist parties as far as an outsider can tell. One hears that the cadres are now exercising more of the right to criticize and question the leadership, but with what degree of effectiveness one cannot tell. Is there not a lesson here for non-Communist ruling parties like the Congress as well? If a ruling party has no properly working democratic structures within it, can it be the guardian of democracy in a republic like India?

In the Soviet Union they have set up the Congress of Peoples' Deputies and a Supreme Soviet elected by them as a balancing force to check the power of the Party. In India also the Parlia-

ment or the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha have to be strengthened and made more independent of the ruling Party leadership, if a genuinely democratic structure is to evolve.

Equally important is the democratisation of the Party. In the Soviet Union two apprehensions inhibit the process of Party democratisation. First and foremost is the fear that the fissiparous tendencies of regional parochialism will immediately begin to disrupt the unity of the Party and thereby the unity of the country. Is there an intrinsic antinomy between democracy and unity? Second, there is the lingering and unexpressed apprehension that proper democratisation of the Party could lead to the removal of the present leadership of the Party. The latter fear is powerfully operative also in other parties like, for example, the parties in India.

Soviet or Chinese socialism has not yet been able to resolve the problem of democratisation of Party structures and the development of adequate democratic checks and balances against the misuse of power by the Party in the name of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Here the changing contours of Socialism have not yet taken a stable form.

### Property Relations

In the Soviet Union, Marxist historians have begun to argue that state ownership of the means of production was more an accident of history than a legitimate principle of socialism. Some argue that the Bolsheviks simply nationalized the property of the bourgeoisie as a punishment for the latter's use of economic power to sabotage the revolution. The argument now is that bourgeois ownership of the means of production has a positive role to play in developing technology to its full measure and in creating a banking or finance system that is essential for large-scale machine industry to come to full flower. Since the transition to socialism was rushed through without waiting for the full development of capitalist production, socialist production now finds itself in the doldrums.

While it is not possible to abandon socialism and go back to



a capitalist economy, as for example the western establishment would like to see the Polish and Hungarian governments do, what present socialist societies like the Soviet Union can do is to permit a plurality of property relations. Some private ownership of the means of production has to exist alongside of state ownership, particularly in the services sector and in small-scale industries. In China already state ownership has itself been diversified—some key areas being kept by the state directly, others being allowed to run as autonomous state enterprise co-operatives. In China a substantial private sector has already developed in the last 10 years. This three-tier system of (a) state-run enterprises, (b) smaller state-owned enterprises merging into autonomous collectives or co-operatives, and (c) a private sector, may also not be normative for all socialist societies.

In the Soviet Union, what are called co-operatives are actually joint stock private enterprises. They have also introduced the "leasing system" in which state enterprises and production units (including farms) are leased out to private management, on a contract basis. In different forms both China and the Soviet Union are resorting to this new device in socialist property relations.

Among the changing contours of socialism is this plurality of property relations. This is justified as part of the process of democratisation, since concentration of ownership in the state leads to an undemocratic and unproductive form of monopoly capital.

The 'mixed economy' concept in developing countries like India was once despised and discredited by Marxist ideology. But what China and the Soviet Union are developing now seems to be clearly mixed economies, though the formula of mixture is of course radically different from that of non-socialist societies like India.

Marxist practice in China and Soviet Union is moving from the recent doctrine of the peaceful co-existence of socialist and capitalist national economies, towards the co-existence of socialism and capitalism within one single national political economy.

This is a major contour change in socialist practice and theory.

### The Command Economy

The contour change in management of the economy of a socialist nation has not yet clearly emerged. The practice of a 'command economy' managed directly by Party and State, i.e. enterprises working by a command system with pre-fixed production targets and bureaucratic management methods, has been found to be unproductive. But an alternative system of management like *khosraschyot* or "cost-accounting/self-financing" has remained more of a concept than a reality. In the Soviet Union, the Supreme Soviet has taken a decision to give economic cost-accounting self-sufficiency to the Baltic republics, but the meaning of this kind of autonomy has not yet been spelt out in legislation or in practical details.

At this point of the management of the economy or state-owned enterprises the prevailing contour of the command system has not yet been replaced by a new system in which there is full democratic worker participation. Such a fully democratic system in which the ensemble of workers have to take collective decisions in major matters may prove to be even less efficient than the command system. But some kind of a hybrid like western capitalist management system with a measure of worker participation is likely to emerge as the new contour of socialist management of the economy.

We are living in a period of transition in which important decisions are being taken and radical experiments undertaken. The contours of socialism are in process of radical change, and stable contours are yet to emerge.

### Conclusion

There are people in the West who indulge fondly in the wishful thinking that socialism has admitted defeat and collapsed, and that capitalism, the victor, has no challengers and can carry on unchecked. Nothing could be more dangerous as an assumption.



Socialism as it developed since 1917, has been basically distorted, as Pandit Nehru perceived early. He saw the distortion in the indiscriminate use of violent methods and in the denial of democracy. At these two points Nehru was obviously right.

If unselfish dedication and devoted service to the people are the basics of Socialism, some of the present changes in its contours, in so far as they promote greed and acquisitiveness with "commodity fetishism", do not augur so well. But Socialism itself seems to be full of creative dynamism. Ten years later we may be able to see the now changing contours more clearly.

#### NOTES

1. Text in A.B. Shah (ed) *Jawaharlal Nehru—A Critical Tribute*, Indian Committee for Cultural Freedom, Manaktalas, Bombay, 1965 see pp. 120-121.
2. *Beijing Review* Vol 31. No. 46. November 14-20, 1988 p. 21.
3. *ibid.*
4. Karl Marx, *Capital* Vol. 3. p. 606.
5. V. I. Lenin, "Can the Bolsheviks Retain State Power?", *Collected Works*, Progress Publishers, Moscow, Vol 26. 1972. p. 106.
6. See for example, *The problem of Man in Philosophy*, "Social Sciences Today" Editorial Board, Moscow, 1988; *History, Society and The Individual* (same publishers, 1988); *Social Sciences* 2 (1988), USSR Academy of Sciences.
7. Marx's more abstractly philosophical discussions were in his early premanifesto period, especially in *The Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*. The mature Marx contented himself with an ongoing polemic against prevailing German idealism, rather than any attempt at systematic statement of his own philosophy.
8. *sub voce* "Man" p. 240.

#### News and Notes

#### Ghana : Concern about Government Curbs on Religious Groups (by G.B.K. Owusu)

The government of Ghana has ordered a freeze on activities and closed meeting places of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (Mormons) and Jehovah's Witnesses. Two other groups, the Nyame Smompa Church of Ekwankrom, and the Church of Jesus Christ of Dzorwulu were also disbanded.

Residence permits of expatriate staff of the first two groups were revoked; staff have left Ghana. The government statement said that despite repeated warnings, the Mormons and Jehovah's Witnesses continued to act in ways which undermined Ghanaian sovereignty and were not conducive to public order.

Meanwhile, the Religious Bodies Registration Law 1989 has been signed by Chairman J.J. Rawlings of the ruling Provisional National Defence Council. Among other things, the law provides for the registration of all religious bodies and the filing of their constitutions and annual accounts.

It says every religious body must have a board of trustees, and no registration certificate will be issued unless the National Commission for Culture is satisfied its trustees and governing body have been validly appointed. Assets of religious bodies not in compliance are to be confiscated.

The law also provides that no one can use the title 'pastor' 'or any other title connoting an official leader of a religious body unless he belongs to a registered body and is qualified under the constitution of that body to be so designated, or holds a qualification of that body to be so designated, or holds a qualification for such title conferred by an officially recognized institution for religious studies and training.' The penalty for



violating that provision is a fine of up to 100000 Ghanaian cedi and/or a prison term of up to three months.

The Christian Council (CCG), Pentecostal Association (GPA), and Conference of Roman Catholic Bishops have all expressed concern about the new law.

At a joint emergency meeting, representatives of both CCG and GPA appealed to the government to be especially careful in dealing with religious matters. 'Since our relationship with the government has been cordial, we expected that at least bona fide and recognized religious bodies would be invited to discuss this issue,' they said. 'Our relationship with the government has been cordial and we have on many occasions been consulted on matters concerning national interests. We are not ... against the registration per se but the modalities.'

CCG and GPA said that as their members are already registered, they should not have to register again, and added that the mushrooming number of dangerous sects whose leaders commit various crimes can be dealt with by other laws. 'We have no fears about the registration but we think it is not in the interest of freedom of worship,' they observed. They urged that the three-month registration deadline be extended to five, and that it be on a national, rather than a congregational level.

After their annual meeting, the Roman Catholic bishops cautioned that the action of the government with regard to sects, 'though well timed, ... endangers all religious groups, as it has a precedent which might be used to proscribe all forms of religious expression in the future.'

Commenting, the Ghana Christian Messenger newspaper said Christians should not be unduly alarmed since the aim of the law is to check excesses and abuses; it is 'a bold attempt to streamline and reorganize all religious bodies.'

[EPS]

### **Old Catholics Mark 100 Years of Union of Utrecht**

Old Catholicism, one of the smaller Christian communions in the world, marked the 100th anniversary of its formal

organization this month with major festivities (22-24 September) in Utrecht (Netherlands).

The Old Catholic Union of Utrecht groups dioceses in the Netherlands, FRG (West Germany), Austria, Switzerland, USA, Canada, and Poland. There are also Old Catholic communities in Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, France, Italy, Belgium, GDR (East Germany), and Sweden.

Worldwide Old Catholic population is roughly 500 000. The 4.5 million-member Philippine Independent Church is Old Catholic in orientation, but not a member of the Union of Utrecht.

Three streams have flowed into what is now Old Catholicism—a split in Dutch Catholicism in the early 1700s; 'national Catholicism' in Switzerland, Germany, and what was then Austria-Hungary, and resistance there to the 1870 declaration of papal infallibility; and a split in Catholicism in North America at the end of 19th century, involving chiefly ethnic Poles.

On 24 September 1889, Old Catholic bishops from the Netherlands, Switzerland, Germany, and Austria-Hungary formally began the Union of Utrecht by signing a declaration of their allegiance to what they described as the faith and order of the undivided church as handed down in the creeds and dogmatic decisions of ecumenical councils of the first 10 centuries.

They began with a motto taken from the fifth-century theologian Vincent of Lerins: 'Let us hold that faith which has been believed everywhere, always, by all. For that is truly and in the strictest sense Catholic.'

Under the terms of the 1931 Bonn Agreement, there is full communion between most of Old Catholicism and most of Anglicanism, although in the 1970s the Polish National Catholic Church of North America ended that relationship with the [US-based] Episcopal Church and the Anglican Church of Canada because they have ordained women as priests.

In Old Catholicism, women have been ordained deacons, but



not priests, although the Catholic Diocese of the Old Catholics in Germany went on record this year in favour of such ordinations.

Earlier, that diocese established a relationship of eucharistic sharing with the Evangelical (United, Lutheran, and Reformed) Landeskirchen (regional churches) in the two Germanys. That decision has been strongly criticized in some other parts of Old Catholicism.

Besides like Anglicanism, Old Catholicism has also had extensive dialogue with Eastern Orthodoxy. In recent years, theologians from those two traditions have announced full agreement on main theological issues, which some think could lead the way to full communion between them.

The Eastern Orthodox co-chair of the dialogue, Metropolitan Damaskinos of Switzerland, was the main ecumenical speaker scheduled in Utrecht. Other events held in connection with the anniversary, included an international conference of theologians, a seminar for women, and a youth gathering.

The 25th International Old Catholic Congress is scheduled for Geneva next August (27-31). [EPS]

### **Roman Catholic Patriarch of Goa Criticizes Tourism Industry**

...The heavy influx of foreign tourists is influencing the socio-cultural identity of the local population by an alien lifestyle, in which nudism and free sex are becoming an accepted social norm. This is having a highly detrimental effect specially on our youth. ...Nudism has become a tourist attraction to... domestic tourists...from conservative rural India.

...The hotel industry has given fillip to... prostitution. Although drug abuse is a global phenomenon, the role of tourism in [it] cannot be ignored, specially as regards Goa. It is a fact that drug abuse among local youth is mainly prevalent in the tourist-infested coastal belt...

The lure of easy money that can come from the tourist trade has become a great temptation to many Goan families. These families have shifted their residence to small out-houses or even huts, and have rented their relatively comfortable houses to foreign tourists. Money or material gain thus becomes often the only value, the only criterion of life.

International tourism very often is instrumental in introducing a new culture, replacing the genuine human values of honesty, hard work, respect for the dignity of human persons and for the local culture, simplicity of life, natural bonds of family life, and deep religious faith.

The role of money power in influencing official decision-making and in suppressing public resentment or sometimes even manipulating public opinion through its propaganda machinery is a factor to be reckoned with.

The tourism industry...competes with the needs of the local population in the use of scarce resources—water, electricity, essential commodities—resulting in the skyrocketing of prices. ...Too many luxury hotels along the beach line...will result in defacing the natural beauty of the sea front. It will also make access to the beaches more restricted for the ordinary citizen.

It places maximum demand on natural resources. In the opinion of a prominent architect, each five-star hotel consumes water enough to supply five Goan villages. A study in Malaysia about electric consumption shows that the energy consumed per 5-star tourist is equivalent to 36 times the average energy consumed by a domestic consumer....

These hotel chains monopolize ancillary trades thereby getting or controlling all profits. Major profits go to the owners. ...Any economic benefits flowing from tourism—which obviously are not denied—are to be weighed against this background....

...[Ecological ill effects are also serious.] Construction of resorts in certain coastal areas..., after removing the sand-dunes' has apparently exposed the low-lying villages in this coastal



area to serious danger of ecological disaster against which the dunes protected them.

Large-scale destruction of natural tree cover to make room for vast hotel complexes is bound to create ecological disturbances that have not yet been foreseen. Discharge of sewage from a large number of hotels along the seafront into the sea is bound to pollute it in course of time, thus making it unfit for swimming, not to mention the destruction of sea life..... [EPS]

[This is excerpted from a pastoral letter of Paul Gonsalves is Roman Catholic Patriarch of the East Indies and Archbishop of Goa and Damao.]

### **Metropolitan Philip Saliba : 'On Being Orthodox in America'**

...In 1950...in Damascus...I wrote an article in one of the leading Syrian newspapers about some external forms in the church such as beards, cassocks, etc., etc. The reaction of the ecclesiastical authorities to my article was one of the reasons which prompted me to leave the Middle East for the New World. ...After my consecration to the episcopate in 1966, every time I traveled to the Middle East on church business, my own father would look at me, shake his head and say, 'Are you really a bishop? Where is your beard?' ...I am now 58 years old and still do not know the significance of beards in the history of salvation....

[Referring to the 50th anniversary last year of St Vladimir's, an Eastern Orthodox seminary just north of New York City, Bishop Saliba observed:] The basic goals of the seminary, which were the publication of theological books and the education of priests to serve our ethnic communities, have been well realized. The question now is where do we go from here? Do we have a mission to America and are we prepared for this mission? Can Orthodoxy in America acquire an American expression to appeal to mainstream America? These are serious questions which challenge all of us.

In 1985, writing about mission, [US Eastern Orthodox theologian] Father John Meyendorff said: 'Is our liturgical life meaningful enough to be shared with newcomers? Or is it functional only in terms of providing comfort and satisfaction to our present membership?' ...[These newcomers] are the millions of unchurched and churchd Americans who are anxiously searching for oneness of faith, apostolicity, catholicity, holiness and meaning in religion. But, can we impose on 'newcomers' the cultural and religious expressions of the Middle East, Byzantium and Czarist Russia?

Is it not time that we seriously re-examine some of our liturgical and theological expressions in the light of our experience on this continent? I am not speaking here about changing the fundamentals of our faith which 'once and for all was delivered to the saints'. I am just referring to certain liturgical and cultural expressions which are foreign to the American mind....

I am talking about bringing America to Orthodoxy. The dilemma which we are facing is: To what kind of Orthodoxy do we want to bring America? Can we bring America to an Arabized, Hellenized or Russianized Orthodoxy? ...Is it possible that the life-giving Spirit, which is always vivifying the church, made her freeze at one point in history?

If you look at some Byzantine icons of the Pantocrator, you would think that Christ is a Byzantine emperor. Do we want to impose this culture on America? Moreover, can we impose our Byzantine and Slavonic melodies, which are the product of other cultures, on America? It is time to stop romanticizing the past and listen to 'what the Spirit is saying to the Church'?

We Orthodox must realize once and for all that we are on this continent to stay, and that we should integrate our old cultures into the new cultural reality of this land. ...[And as] it is very difficult to bring America to a divided Orthodoxy and .. even more difficult for America to understand our jurisdictional problems .. we must put our own house in order [by uniting the multiple ethnic jurisdictions on the continent]. .....[EPS]



[Metropolitan Saliba heads the Antiochian Orthodox Christian Archdiocese of North America, part of the Damascus-based (Greek) Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch. This is part of his message to the archdiocesan convention earlier this year.]

### **Russian Orthodox Bishops Warn about Discipline and Obedience**

**Moscow**—The Holy Synod (executive committee of bishops) of the Russian Orthodox Church has released an appeal from Patriarch Pimen to diocesan bishops 'reminding them of the strict keeping of church unity, canonical discipline, Christian morals, and piety.'

The Information Bulletin of the Russian Orthodox Department of External Relations says 'negative occurrences in the life of certain dioceses' prompted the appeal.

It also observes that 'certain persons have expressed oral and written critiques of hierarchs and clergy' which has led to 'the disturbance of peace and church unity. There are also cases of the weakening of church discipline and church obedience on the part of some clergymen and laymen.'

The synod statement reminds diocesan bishops to 'make full use of their...ministry, to hold regular meetings on the levels of dioceses, deaneries, and parishes, to build up and deepen church unity, to encourage pastors and their flock to a more active participation in the life of the church and society, and to care for the increase of Christian piety and morals.'

In other action, a synod commission studying materials which could lead to the rehabilitation of clergy and laity 'repressed in the Soviet period', held its first meeting. A church report says the group is 'proceeding from the wish to remove even the slightest shadow of doubt from the children of the church repressed in the Soviet period as to their disloyalty to the Soviet state or hostile attitude to the Motherland and its people, as well as any suspicions thrown upon them due to their ordination and religious convictions.'

However, it stressed the 'significant difference between civil rehabilitation and recovery of the good name of priests or lay people who honestly performed their religious duty to society.' It said that 'from the religious-ethical point of view', those who 'innocently suffered for the faith and the name of Christ do not need rehabilitation....They are worthy of being honoured by the church as martyrs or confessors.'

It added that 'civil rehabilitation is first of all a task of the state and society as a whole which now take it as their purpose the recovery of honest names of citizens who all suffered innocently for the sake of truth and good. 'The church', it continued, 'is ready to assist in this noble task by our society with a balanced approach to this difficult problem. We are happy to participate in the process of renewal and the building of a society and state governed by law.'

And, even though 'the church does not bear any responsibility for repressions and is not legally obliged to compensate losses to the victims', the commission said the church should 'raise funds or render other help to the victims of repressions themselves, or to their direct relatives in case they do not have any other sources for existence, or these sources are inadequate.'

Meanwhile, in an open letter to the Russian Orthodox Church, the new Independent Fund for the Preservation of Christian Culture has called for a formal church declaration that the last Russian tsar and his family are saints.

The royal family was shot in the wake of the 1917 revolution. The US-based Russian Orthodox Church Outside of Russia, has already made such a declaration. [EPS]

### **Religious Liberty Group Honours Soviet Official**

**London**—At its Third World Congress on Religious Liberty (here 23-26 July), a group with strong Seventh-day Adventist backing honoured the former head of the Soviet government Council on Religious Affairs. Konstantin Kharchev, who recently



became a Soviet diplomat, received a plaque from the International Religious Liberty Association for his 'contribution to trust between all peoples that weaves peace.'

Kharchev told the 200-plus delegates from about 50 countries that in the Soviet Union 'a believer is no longer an enemy.' And, he observed, 'a person who believes is better than a person who believes nothing.' He said 'the ideal relationship between churches and the [Soviet] state is still far off', but described a proposed new Soviet law on religion as 'significant progress'. Under the proposal, 'people will be able to meet and pray without any kind of registration. But churches will have to register if they want to buy property.'

Asked if a separate Ukrainian Catholic or Ukrainian Orthodox church would be allowed to register and buy property, he said 'several different proposals are under discussion', adding that 'this involves complex religious questions and political questions dating back 400 years. All parties must act with the greatest prudence.' (The Russian Orthodox Church, the main grouping of Christians in the Soviet Union, has opposed a separate existence for either a Ukrainian or Ukrainian Catholic Church.) [EPS]

### **China :**

#### **newspaper says new law on religion coming**

**Beijing**—The official China Daily newspaper says new legislation on religion is being prepared whose purpose will be to 'strengthen religious liberty' and improve Chinese relations with religious communities overseas. However, it added, 'no foreign religious organization will have permission to get mixed up in internal affairs of the country.'

[EPS]

## **RECEPTION IN THE KREMLIN**

On July 21, the Soviet Government gave a reception at the St. George Hall of the Great Kremlin Palace in honour of the participants of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches (WCC) meeting in Moscow.

Eminent religious leaders were welcomed by N.I. Ryzhkov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR.

### **Speech by Prime Minister N.I. Ryzhkov**

Respected participants in the meeting of the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches!

Dear guests!

First of all I would like to greet you all warmly as well-known representatives of Christian Churches and religious associations from many countries of the world, who for the first time have come to Moscow to hold a meeting of the Central Committee of the largest international ecumenical organization—the World Council of Churches. The very fact that this meeting is taking place in the capital of the Soviet Union cannot but testify to the great changes our society is now living through.

The changes have also entered the relations between State and Church. We have every reason to say that these are taking today a normal course of development. And this is only natural because the clergy and the believing citizens at large are patriots of their country, supporting the 'perestroika' and new approaches to the State-Church relations in the conditions of socialist renewal and democratization. As rightfully noted by M.S. Gorbachev, we all have one common history, one homeland, and one future.

I am sure that believers and non-believers alike are unanimous in their attitude to the noble moral-ethical ideals and are seeking together to embody common human aspirations in life.



To remove all what is alien to the very nature of Socialism, to restore its original humanistic meaning, there is going on a radical, all-round perestroika. A deep social and economic transformation is taking place, and our state and political system as a whole, including public relations, are being improved. We openly acknowledge the difficult stages of our history, analyzing the causes of distortions and seeking to provide legal guarantees against them at present and in the future.

Of course, the break-up of the old ways and the establishment of the new ones is never to pass easily and smoothly. The important thing today is to remain consistent and steady in our course towards renewal and concrete actions in humanizing all spheres of the life of our society and never to give in when facing emerging difficulties and temporary failures.

The perestroika which is being carried out on the truly democratic basis has recently received general support, as was manifested during the elections of people's deputies of the USSR, at their first Congress, at the session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, which have done much to make the enormous potential inherent in the socialist system to reveal itself to a fuller extent.

Together with the supreme body of State power all the Soviet people are now learning good political lessons. People in various ways are trying to make their own individual contribution to the state decision-making and further implementation of these decisions. But besides this exceptionally important part of the matter there is another one, no less important for all of us, namely: all people, individually, in social groups and as a whole nation, are taking very important lessons in mutual understanding, in tolerance of each other, in respecting each other's opinions, in pluralism and in the quest for reasonable compromises. This is precisely what allows for combining the efforts undertaken for our common interests by people of different worldviews, faiths and nationalities.

We do recognize the efforts of our clergymen for the vitally important consolidation of our society, for educating people in respect to each other, for promoting humanistic principles in

our life. We see that the religious believers and clergy do support the course for a radical renewal of the Soviet society, for the improvement of people's life, for enrooting the principles of social justice, and bringing about a clean moral atmosphere.

Our country undergoes the formation of a modern socialist state of law. Another very important legal act—the Law on the freedom of conscience and on religious organizations—is under consideration.

This document is being elaborated with full consideration for new attitudes to the State-Church relations, complying with the spirit and the essence of perestroika and democratization of the Soviet society. It is to juridically ensure the right of the citizens to the freedom of conscience and provide for the believers to enjoy every possibility for participation in the life of the society and its renewal. The draft of the law takes into account the norms of international acts adopted by the United Nations as well as the Vienna Concluding Document.

In the new conditions there are opening up favourable opportunities for the Church to increase its contribution to the establishment of humanity's moral norms of behaviour, of civil responsibility and of Soviet patriotism. We hope that the Church and the believers will get even more actively involved in the struggle against anti-social phenomena, such as drunkenness and alcoholism, hooliganism and crime, extremist and nationalistic ways. We are willing to widen our cooperation with the Church in protecting the monuments of the past, in preserving the cultural legacy of the peoples of the USSR. Deep respect is due to the churches for their involvement in different voluntary funds, above all — in the V.I. Lenin Children's Fund, in the Charity Fund offering support to the elderly people and invalids.

Protection of the environment has become another important sphere of our concerted efforts. Here is a wide field of activity for anyone in the Soviet Union — for atheist and believer, for State and Church alike.

The Soviet Government respectfully acknowledge the peace activity of the Church and its involvement in the struggle for



disarmament, for a nuclear-free non-violent world, and for international cooperation. Since a new thinking started to pave its way into the realm of world's politics, the process of the humanization of international relations has been gathering momentum.

Coming to an end is the situation where different ideologies or worldviews impeded and at times made it impossible to have a constructive dialogue with many foreign partners. The obsolete and in a certain degree originally wrong stereotypes are broken. The priority of common human values comes to the forefront as a guide-line principle of foreign policy. Overcoming the enemy image, as an attribute of the humanization of international relations has materialized through real moves in the field of disarmament, — nuclear and chemical above all — and in the relaxation of military confrontation.

It goes without saying that there are still many urgent problems to be solved to make the relations among states truly more healthy. These include the deliverance of humanity from hunger, disease, from the contrasting life-styles of rich and poor nations, from the ecological and other common human ailments, the liquidation of all the forms of inequality and racism, the cessation of regional conflicts.

Under the present conditions, the external policy does not exclusively belong in the competence of governments and official diplomacy. The role of public opinion, of people's diplomacy has grown considerably. Their efforts are coming together into one stream flowing in the direction of humanity's all-round progress. The Church is making a great contribution to this noble cause.

"Peace, justice and the integrity of creation"—this is the motto of your meeting. One can only welcome the fact that your work is permeated with humanistic ideals and that it is going in a promising direction.

Let your efforts serve the good of the present and future generations of all nations in the world!

Kremlin, 21 July 1989

## Speech by Emilio Castro, WCC General Secretary

Your Excellency, the Prime Minister Nikolai Ryzhkov,  
Your Excellency, the President of the Council for Religious  
Affairs Mr. Yuri Chistoradnov,  
Comrades, Brothers & Sisters

Let me express our profound gratitude that your Excellency being in the middle of a session of the Supreme Soviet of this Nation, has found the time, the freedom and the willingness to receive us in this beautiful place. I would also like to express our special gratitude for the personal interest that you have taken in the predicament of the Armenian people. The Armenian churches both in this country and in the diaspora are very dear to our heart. The churches of the world have expressed solidarity with them after the terrible earthquake they suffered. We recognize that your government and you personally were involved not only in the relief and rehabilitation operation but in trying to provide possibilities of dialogue and peace among nationalities. For this let me express our profound personal gratitude. We are the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches coming from many, many nations, as you can see by our faces. We came to experience the hospitality, the fellowship and the friendship of the people of the Soviet Union, especially of the churches of the Soviet Union. They belong to the wider Christian family and they have always been working with us trying to serve the cause of peace and understanding among the people. So it was logical that we should respond with warm interest to their invitation.

But there was more than that invitation. Your country has added to all dictionaries of the world two words: *Perestroika* and *Glasnost*. You have provoked not only the curiosity but also been included in the prayers of millions and millions of believers all over the world for this attempt to restructure your society. So we came to live together with you a few days of this beautiful moment in your history, so that we may learn from your experience and so that we can encourage the government, the churches, the people in this attempt to dream of a more human future. Many of us had the chance last year to celebrate with you the milenium of the baptism of the Russian people. We were privileged to lay the foundation stone of the future Cathedral Church of Moscow. Even though we know



that the Cathedral will take a long time to be built. we dream to be alive to come to the opening of the Cathedral.

But already we rejoice in the hundreds and thousands of churches that are being reopened in your country giving your people a chance to express their spirituality, and their cultural and spiritual values. But we follow the events in your country not only through the eyes of the churches, we follow them through the eyes of millions of people in the world who rejoice that today there is hope for peace, hope for disarmament. Your new thinking in relation to your nation, in relation to the international world is providing a unique chance to build a more fraternal world—but your Excellency, as you will easily understand, it is not enough that the two powerful military blocs come to understand each other. We have friends in our Central Committee who come from Central America, where peace is still a dream. Others come from South Africa where racial discrimination is rampant and where there is no peace at all. Others come from Ethiopia where a war between socialist brothers is pouring blood on the hills of a beautiful nation. And I could go on mentioning other local conflicts where people, children are suffering and where the participation of your government and a fraternal attitude towards the reconciliation of the warring factions is and will be an important factor.

We know of your participation in the instruments of the United Nations and we encourage you to use them more and more for the solving of those particular conflicts. We need to make of this world a home for the homeless, a home for the powerless. We have a common human dream that should be the dynamic basis of all our endeavours. We know that if we continue to analyse the situation as you did in your speech, we will find many points of common concern and common hope. We believe that human beings have been called to be co-creators with God, to live in this world in praise of the Creator and make it into a fraternal home for everybody. I might be tempted to quote some of the most beautiful pages of Karl Marx, dreaming of the new man, of the new creature. He was dreaming out of the same biblical tradition from which we come, and in that dream of the new man, the promise of human beings, the promise of God for our common future, in that common dream we hope that between us will have many steps to take in common.

For the hospitality of the Russian people, for the warm fellowship of the Christian churches, for your presence here this afternoon, for this reception many, many thanks.

## An Appeal to the Readers

Dear Readers,

We are publishing **The Star of the East** under great financial difficulties. Increased postal rates have made it almost impossible to send the journal to readers abroad by air mail. Many people inside and outside the country are interested in this journal, but the return from subscriptions is incredibly low. There are no paid staff to run the periodical. We depend entirely on the goodwill of friends and well-wishers. We, therefore, appeal to you to send regularly your subscriptions and make a generous gesture to sustain this important publication.

for **The Star of the East**  
Publisher



# THE STAR OF THE EAST

THE STAR OF THE EAST is an Indian Orthodox ecumenical quarterly, published under the editorial responsibility of Metropolitan Dr. Paulos Mar Gregorios of Delhi. It is the continuation of an occasional journal carrying the same name originally published by the late Rev. Dr. C. T. Eapen of the Orthodox Syrian Church of India. The journal will deal with contemporary issues of ecumenism, especially from the perspective of the Orthodox Churches, and will carry news about the major events in the life of these Churches.

All correspondence, articles, news, exchange periodicals, books for review and subscription enquiries may be addressed to :

The Editor  
The Star of the East  
The Delhi Orthodox Centre  
2, Tughlakabad Institutional Area  
New Delhi-110 062

Single copy in India	Rs. 6.00
"    Outside India	US \$ 1 00

## Annual Subscription Rates :

In India	Rs. 20.00
Outside India (By Seamail)	US \$ 6.00
(By Airmail)	US \$ 10.00
For Indian Theological Students	Rs. 12.00

## Life Subscription :

(In India)	Rs. 200.00
(Outside India)	US \$ 1000.00